

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

CWP No. 6694 of 2008
Date of decision:30.4.2008

Rakesh Kumar

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE M.M.KUMAR

HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SABINA

Present: Mr.Vishal Garg, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mrs.Charu Tuli, Sr.DAG, Punjab.

JUDGMENT

M.M.KUMAR, J.

The prayer made by the petitioner in the instant petition is that directions be issued to respondents No. 1 to 5 namely the State of Punjab, Deputy Commissioner, Fatehgarh Sahib, Senior Superintendent of Police, Fatehgarh Sahib, Sub Divisional Magistrate, Khamanon and the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Khamanon to provide police protection to him and his employees for execution and performance of the transport contract for the loading and unloading of specials at Khamanon Centre, District Fatehgarh Sahib for railhead at Sirhind to the Food Corporation of India. The protection has been sought on the basis of allegations levelled

against respondents No. 6 to 16, truck union and its members, who are allegedly threatening and not allowing the petitioner to execute the work.

In response to notice of motion, the official respondents No. 3 and 5 have filed reply, by way of affidavit, in Court today, which is taken on record. In para 11 of the reply, it is stated that the petitioner has never contacted the local police for any protection or help from them. It has further been stated by the learned State counsel that the respondents are ready to furnish any security to the petitioner provided that the necessary information is supplied to the local police.

In view of the above, learned counsel for the petitioner states that as and when the specials are to be loaded/unloaded and there is apprehension of threat from the truck union, respondent No.6, or its members, respondents No. 7 to 16, then he will intimate the official respondents for providing police protection.

As a sequel to the above discussion, the writ petition has been rendered infructuous and is disposed of as such. However, the respondents shall remain bound by their undertaking given to this Court for providing security to the petitioner.

(M.M.KUMAR)
JUDGE

(SABINA)
JUDGE

April 30, 2008

anita