

105

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

**CRM-M No.16269 of 2015  
Date of Decision: 20.05.2015**

**JODHA SINGH DEOL**

**.....Petitioner**

**Vs**

**STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS**

**.....Respondents**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH**

Present: Mr. Gaurav Sharma, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

\*\*\*\*

1. *Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?*
2. *To be referred to the Reporters or not ?*
3. *Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?*

**RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J. (Oral)**

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that despite rejection of regular bail to respondents No.7 and 8 namely Mangjeet Singh and Babu Singh by this Court vide order dated 15.01.2015, respondents No.3 to 6 have not acted fairly in terms of bringing the investigation to some logical end. Reference has been made to Annexure P-5 showing state of affairs prevailing with the Police.

The first part of prayer made in the petition relates to arrest of accused and to file challan to channellise behaviour of the Investigating Agency to investigate the offence in a particular manner. Even though it is not prerogative of the Court, but the Court can take judicial notice of the fact if investigation is found suffering

with vices of favouritism and partiality. At this juncture, this Court does not intend to go into the veracity of allegations or otherwise.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of Court, Mr. Arshdeep S. Kler, D.A.G., Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of official respondents. Let requisite copies of petition be supplied to him by learned counsel for the petitioner during course of the day.

In view of nature of order which this Court proposes to pass there is no necessity of filing reply at this stage.

Without commenting upon anything on merits of the case, entire exercise is being left to the wisdom of respondent No.3 (who has been wrongly impleaded by name) who in his official capacity is directed to ensure proper investigation of the case and to eradicate any instinct of illegality and arbitrariness in the investigation.

Respondent No.3 may evolve his own fact-finding mechanism to extract truth and thereafter to take appropriate steps to bring the investigation of the case to some logical end. In the process if respondent No.3 finds that there is reasonable apprehension qua life and liberty of petitioner, then necessary steps may also be taken in furtherance thereof.

Petition stands disposed of accordingly.

May 20, 2015

*Atik*

**(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)  
JUDGE**