

HARPAL SINGH

...Petitioner

Versus

ARUN PAL SINGH AND ORS

....Respondents

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice B.S. Walia

Present : Mr. Beant Singh Seemar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ayush Sarna, AAG, Punjab.

B.S. Walia, J. (Oral)

[1] Prayer in the petition is for initiating proceedings against the respondents for intentional and willful defiance of order, Annexure P/1, dated 03.08.2022 in CRWP No.7388 of 2022 in case titled as Harpal Singh vs. State of Punjab and Ors.

[2] A perusal of order, Annexure P/1 reveals that while issuing notice of motion in CRWP No.7388 of 2022 for 31.10.2022, it was ordered that in the meantime, Commissioner of Police, Amritsar would get the threat perception of the petitioner examined and also as to whether any of the private respondents were illegally camping near the premises of the school, as was reflected in the photographs and in case it was found that there was genuine threat to the life, liberty and property of the petitioner, then adequate steps as warranted under law be taken so as to ensure that no harm was caused to the petitioner or to his property.

[3] Learned AAG has produced copy of reply dated 21.09.2022 along with Annexures R1/T to R/5. The same is taken on record. Copy

thereof supplied to learned counsel for the petitioner, who states that in view of the averments made in the reply as also in view of speaking order, Annexure R/5 dated 17.09.2022 as per which one Personal Security Officer has been provided to the petitioner initially for a period of 15 days with a fresh assessment of the threat perception to be carried out before expiry of 15 days, besides, registration of FIR No.297 dated 17.09.2022 under Sections 427/448/511/506/148 and 149 IPC at Police Station B-Division, Amritsar City as also FIR No.298 dated 17.09.2022 under Sections 379, 506, 148 and 149 IPC at Police Station B-Division, Amritsar, he does not press the instant petition but prays for issuance of directions to the respondents that if on fresh assessment of threat perception a decision is taken to withdraw the security cover provided to the petitioner, the petitioner be given seven days notice of proposal to withdraw the security cover.

[4] In view of the position noted above as well as the statement of learned counsel for the petitioner, the instant petition is disposed of as not calling for any action against the respondents under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 while directing that in the eventuality of decision to withdraw security cover to the petitioner on assessment of the threat perception, then in that eventuality a notice in writing be served on the petitioner along with copy of the decision against acknowledgement in token of receipt while giving the petitioner seven days notice of the proposed action to withdraw the security cover.

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

22.09.2022

'Amit'

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