

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

-.-

Crl. Misc. No. M 205 of 2015

Date of decision: 06.01.2015

Sukhdev Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondent(s)

Coram: Hon'ble Mrs. Justice Rekha Mittal

-.-

Present: Mr. Harchand Singh Batth Advocate
for the petitioner

-.-

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

Rekha Mittal, J.

The present petition under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (in short, 'Cr.P.C.') has been preferred for issuance of directions to respondents No. 2 and 3 to look into grievances of the petitioner expressed by way of complaint/representation dated 30.10.2014 (Annexure P3) and affidavit of even date (Annexure P4).

Counsel for the petitioner contends that Saraj Singh, Inchagre, Police Post Gharyala, Police Station Valthoha, District Tarn Taran (respondent No. 5) has indicted petitioner's both sons in cases registered under the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (in short, NDPS Act) vide FIRs (Annexures P1 and P2). The said respondent

received an amount of Rs.48,000.00 from the petitioner as illegal gratification to extend favour to his sons but failed to release them from custody. It is further argued that the petitioner would be satisfied if a direction is issued to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Tarn Taran-respondent No. 3 to look into grievance of the petitioner in regard to illegally taking of Rs.48,000.00 from the petitioner and initiating action against the defaulting police official.

I have heard counsel for the petitioner and find no reason to intervene in exercise of inherent jurisdiction under Section 482 Cr.P.C.

A plain reading of the allegations set up in the petition would make it apparent that the petitioner is seriously aggrieved against respondent No. 5 as both his sons have been booked for committing offence punishable under Section 22 of the NDPS Act. The petitioner has raised vague allegations in regard to demand of illegal gratification and acceptance of an amount of Rs.48,000.00 by respondent No. 5. The petition is conspicuously silent as to the date on which the alleged demand was made and date, time and place when the amount of Rs.48,000.00 was accepted by respondent No. 5.

In view of the above, the petition is dismissed *in limine*.

(Rekha Mittal)
Judge

06.01.2015
mohan