



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CRWP-5501-2025
DECIDED ON: 27.05.2025**

RAM DHAN

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Saurabh Chobey, Advocate
for the petitioner. (through Hybrid Mode).

Mr. Chetan Sharma, DAG Haryana

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus seeking direction to the respondents No.2 and 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioner and his family members at the hands of private respondents including the accused persons mentioned in the FIR No.46 dated 05.05.2025 under Sections 115, 126, 190, 191(3), 351(3) of BNS, 2023 registered at Police Station Nizampur, District Mahendergarh (Annexure P-6).

At the outset, learned State counsel would submit that the adequate security has already been provided to the petitioner as earlier there were four home guards deputed around the house of the petitioner for the last two weeks, which have now been reduced to two and from tomorrow onward against there will be three home guards on duty. He further submits that the reduction in number of

home guards has also a reason, which is beyond the control of administration as well since one home guard is went on leave but from tomorrow onward he is joining the duty back after completion of leave. In addition, regular patrolling by the Police Control Room (PCR) is in place, and the security of the petitioner is being monitored by the Station House Officer, Police Station Nizampur, District Mahendargarh

The aforesaid facts could not be controverted by learned counsel for the petitioner, who is on record to say that he did not have such instructions from his client.

In the light of above, this Court has no reason to disbelieve the submissions made by learned State counsel and on that account, I am of the considered opinion that the present petition is merely an academic exercise, having been filed without complete instructions, based on a representation dated 05.04.2025 seeking consideration and decision thereon. However, as is evident from the statement of the learned State counsel, the said representation has already been duly addressed by the competent authorities.

Hence, this petition having no merits, stands dismissed with no order as to costs.

Pending application(s), if any shall disposed off, accordingly.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

27.05.2025

Meenu

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>