



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

106

**CRWP-10492-2024 (O&M)
Date of decision: 24.01.2025**

Jagjit Singh and another**...Petitioners****Versus****State of Punjab and others****...Respondents****CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA**

Present:- Mr. Dharam Bir Bhargav, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, AAG, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance of directions to respondents No. 1 to 5 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners at the hands of respondents No.6 & 7.

2. On 13.11.2024, the following order was passed by this Court :

“...It is submitted that a representation (Annexure P-6) has been filed by petitioner No.1. In this representation, there is no mention of any threat being extended by private respondents to petitioner no.2. Even on a cursory perusal of the averments in the petition, it does not appear that there is any threat to the life and liberty of the petitioner no.2. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that he restricts his claim to the extent to which the relief seeking protection of life and liberty has been claimed by petitioner no.1. It is ordered to be so.

Learned State counsel who has advance notice of the petition seeks time to have instruction in this regard.

2025:PHHC:010602



Adjourned to 12.12.2024.

Short reply with regard to the fate of the representation (Annexure P-6) be submitted on the date fixed.”

2. In compliance with the aforementioned direction, short reply has been filed on behalf of the respondent-State. It is submitted therein and learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab has argued that the representation submitted by petitioner No. 1 has been duly inquired into and it has been found that respondents No. 6 and 7 has never extended any threat to the life and liberty of the said petitioner and the allegations levelled in the representation have been found to be false and baseless.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners could not dispute the factual assertions.

4. In view of the position explained above and also in view of the limited scope of the present petition, without commenting anything on the merits of the case, the present petition is disposed of at this stage as no further orders are called for. However, in case the petitioners feel any threat to their life and liberty in future, they would be at liberty to approach the local police or this Court.

24.01.2025

Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No