



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

CWP-9688-2020 (O&M)
Date of Decision : **11.03.2025**

MAHENDER SINGH CHAWLAPetitioner

VERSUS

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERSRespondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present : Mr. Sanjay Ghalawat, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Satya Pal Jain, Additional Solicitor General of India with
Ms. Saigeeta Srivastava, Advocate,
for respondent no.1-UOI.

Mr.Pankaj Mulwani, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Sahil R. Bakshi, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Mayank Sharma, Advocate,
for applicant/respondent no.4-UT, Chandigarh.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J.(Oral)

CM-6-CWP-2025

1. This application has been filed on behalf of respondent no.4-UT, Chandigarh, seeking modification of the order dated 10.12.2024, as passed by a co-ordinate bench, whereby, a cost of Rs.25,000/- has been imposed.
2. For the good and valid assigned in the application, this Court

deems it appropriate to modify the order (*supra*), and the cost of Rs.25,000/-, as imposed upon the respondent no.4-UT, Chandigarh, is ordered to be made good.

3. **Disposed of** accordingly.

CWP-9688-2020

4. Through the instant writ petition filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, a prayer is made for quashing of order dated 21.12.2019 (Annexure P-6), passed by respondent no.5, whereby the application filed by the present petitioner under clause 5 of the Witness Protection Scheme, 2018 (as amended in 2020), for taking protection measures under clauses 4, 7, 11 and 15 thereof, has been dismissed.

5. He further seeks issuance of a direction upon respondents no.1 to 4 for implementation of the aforesaid Scheme.

6. During the course of hearing, this Court has expanded the scope of the instant petition, as the State of Punjab, as well as UT, Chandigarh, were also arrayed as respondents, and a specific direction was passed upon the State of Punjab, Haryana and UT, Chandigarh, to provide information, as to whether, the Scheme (*supra*), has been meticulously implemented, in the three States or not, and whether the budget has been allocated for the same or not.

7. Separate reliefs were filed on behalf of respondents-States/UT, and a perusal thereof, it reflects that not only the Scheme (*supra*), has been implemented meticulously, but also, the budget has also been allocated. Upon perusal of reply(ies), it also reflects the number of beneficiaries, who have been granted protection under the said

scheme. Therefore, in view of the above, no further direction is required to be passed in this regard.

8. So far as, the grievance of the petitioner with regard to the order dated 21.12.2019 (*supra*), is concerned, instead of quashing the same, this Court deems it fit and appropriate to grant liberty to the petitioner to approach the the competent authority of the State of Haryana again, under the Scheme of 2018 (as amended in 2020), by filing a fresh application.

9. A direction is passed upon the respondent concerned that, in case, such application is filed by the petitioner, an appropriate order shall be passed, after considering his threat perceptions, if any, within a reasonable time period.

10. **Disposed of** accordingly.

March 11, 2025
dhaaramvir

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned. : Yes/No
Whether Reportable. : Yes/No