



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

**COCp-2836-2023(O&M)
Date of decision: 23.09.2025**

Mahender Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

Ajit Singh Shekhawat

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL

Present: Mr. Manoj Tanwar, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Anuj Garg, DAG, Haryana.

VIKRAM AGGARWAL, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner instituted CRWP-6022-2022 [**Mahender Singh v. State of Haryana and others**] seeking protection of his life and liberty, as he was statedly threatened at the hands of the private respondents therein.

2. The said criminal writ petition was disposed of vide order dated 14.07.2023 (Annexure P-6) with the following directions:

“3. If the allegations of apprehension of threat to life turn out to be true, it might lead to an irreversible loss. Thus, in the facts and circumstances peculiar to this case, it shall be appropriate that the concerned Superintendent of Police, SHO, or any officer to whom such powers have been delegated or have been authorized in this regard, provide appropriate protection to the petitioner for one week from today. However, if the petitioner no longer requires the protection, then at their request, it may be discontinued even before the expiry of one week. After that, the concerned officers shall extend the protection on day-to-day analysis of the ground realities or upon the oral or written request of the petitioner.



4. This protection is subject to the stringent condition that from the time such protection is given, the petitioner shall not go outside the boundaries of the place of residence, except for medical necessities, to buy household necessities, and for bereavements in the families of the close relatives or close friends. This restriction saves the petitioner from apprehended risk and ensures that the protection is not flaunted.

5. It is clarified that there is no adjudication on merits and that this order is not a blanket bail in any FIR. It is further clarified that this order shall not come in the way if the interrogation of the petitioner is required in any cognizable case. It shall also be open for the petitioner to approach this Court again in case of any fresh threat perception.

6. *This order shall eclipse after fifteen days from today.*

7. Liberty reserved to the petitioner to file a fresh representation to the concerned Superintendent of Police/ Commissioner of Police, within fifteen days from today. If the petitioner files a representation within the above-mentioned time period of fifteen days, then, the same shall be decided by the concerned Superintendent of Police/Commissioner of Police, within two months.”

3. Subsequently, the petitioner preferred the instant contempt petition, alleging willful and deliberate violation of the aforesaid directions.

3.1 It is the case of the petitioner that he is engaged in real estate business in Samalkha, Delhi and Gurugram. Sushil Kumar @ Babar (respondent No.4 in the writ petition), a notorious gangster, who is running a gang along with the private respondents, demanded ransom from the petitioner and threatened to kill him in case of non-payment. Since the payment was not made, he started stalking the petitioner and his family members. On 09.10.2015, he along with his goons attacked the petitioner



and attempted to abduct him, but fortunately the petitioner managed to escape. FIR No.631 dated 09.10.2015 was registered under Sections 323, 324, 365 & 506 IPC at Police Station Samalkha (Annexure P-1). Certain other instances have also been mentioned in the petition.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of the directions issued on 14.07.2023 in CRWP-6022-2022, the petitioner submitted representations dated 30.08.2023 (Annexures P-7 & P-8) and 08.09.2023 (Annexure P-9), but no action has been taken thereon, which amounts to willful disobedience of the directions issued vide order dated 14.07.2023.

5. Learned State counsel, while referring to the affidavit of Superintendent of Police, Panipat, dated 01.03.2024, submits that no threat perception was found to the petitioner, as a result of which the security provided was withdrawn vide order dated 29.08.2023.

5.1 He further refers to the subsequent affidavit dated 04.09.2024 filed by the Superintendent of Police, Panipat, wherein reference has been made to the report submitted by the Station House Officer, Police Station, Samalkha on 09.09.2023, which clearly indicates that there was no threat to the life and liberty of the petitioner.

6. Today, pursuant to the order dated 08.09.2025 passed by this Court, affidavit of Superintendent of Police, Panipat, dated 22.09.2025, has been filed in Court, which is taken on record. The averments made therein read as under:

“3. That with regard to the submission of the Learned Counsel for the petitioner, it is humbly submitted that the ADGP, CID, Haryana, Panchkula had issued letter memo



no. 83494/SS/A-3 dated, Panchkula the 16.08.2024 regarding the implementation of regulation for providing security on payment basis to protected persons in compliance of orders of this Hon'ble Court in CRM-M-26326-2019 titled as Rajan Kapoor Vs State of Punjab. The suggestive steps for implementation of the regulations as per the above mentioned letter are:-

- i. Identification of protectee eligible for security as per the provisions of the regulation. This may include protectee to whom security is already provided at your own level.
- ii.

Notice to the protectee.

- iii. Latest Threat Assessment report of the Protectee.

- iv. Financial Assessment of the Protectee.

- v. If, the Protectee fulfills the criteria of financial capacity as enunciated in clause 3.4.2 of the said regulation then direct the protectee to deposit required cost of security as per the Haryana Government Letter No. 13/06/96-3 HC dated 23.02.2018 which was further endorsed to all head of the police units in Haryana vide DGP/Haryana's No. 2855-2912/Acctt.-3 Dated 15.03.2018 in compliance of the clause 3.6.1 and 3.6.2 of the said regulation.

True copy of letter issued by ADGP, CID, Haryana is annexed herewith as Annexure R-2.

4. That however, the petitioner's threat assessment report dated 09/09/2023, indicated no threat to his life or liberty. Furthermore, there is no recent complaint, event, or change in circumstances that qualifies the petitioner for protection. As a result, the petitioner did not come under the standard operating procedures/regulations for providing security on a payment basis. However, the police assure to abide by all the directions as will be passed by this Hon'ble Court as per circumstances of



present case accordingly. True Copy of threat assessment report dated 09.09.2023 of the petitioner is already annexed as Annexure R-1 alongwith the short reply filed by Sh. Lokender Singh, the then Superintendent of Police, Panipat.”

7. As per the aforesaid averments, directions have been issued as regards the provision of security to protected persons on payment basis (Annexure R-2). It has further been reiterated that the threat assessment report dated 09.09.2023 indicates that no threat to the life and liberty of the petitioner was found. It has also been averred that the petitioner does not come under the standard operating procedures/regulations for providing security on payment basis.

8. That being so, no further orders are required to be passed in the instant contempt petition, as there is no willful violation of the order passed by the coordinate Bench in CRWP-6022-2022 on 14.07.2023. However, it would be open for the petitioner to avail all such remedies as shall be admissible in law, if so desired.

9. The instant contempt petition is accordingly disposed of.

10. Rule is discharged.

11. Pending application(s), if any, also stands disposed of.

(Vikram Aggarwal)
Judge

September 23, 2025

Rajan

Whether speaking / reasoned:
Whether Reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No