

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-43052 of 2014.
Decided on:-August 25, 2015.

Sunil Gupta.Petitioner.

Versus

State of Haryana and othersRespondents.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA.

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

Present:- Mr. Ravinder Malik, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Manish Bansal, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Sumit Gupta, Advocate
for respondent No.5.

HARI PAL VERMA, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in this petition is for issuance of direction to respondents No.1 to 3 to protect the life, liberty and property of the petitioner from respondent No.5.

Respondents No.1 to 4 have filed a short reply by way of affidavit of Dalip Kumar, HPS, Assistant Commissioner of Police, Headquarter Panchkula. Para No.1 of the said reply reads as under:

“1. That the present petition has been by the petitioner for directing the respondent No.1 to 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioner from respondent No.5. In this regard the

petitioner submitted a complaint before the Director General of Police, Haryana against respondent No.5 Parveen Kumar which was received in the office of respondent No.3 on dated 17.12.2014. The complaint of the petitioner was enquired by the Assistant Superintendent of Police, Panchkula. During the investigation the statement of the complainant and respondent No.5 was recorded. During the investigation it is found that the petitioner and respondent No.5 are businessmen and there is a dispute of money between complainant and respondent No.5. The complainant and respondent No.5 are submitting false complaints against each other. There is no threat to the petitioner. The allegations levelled in the complaint were found false. Hence the complaint of the petitioner was filed.”

The complaint submitted by the petitioner was looked into by the Assistant Superintendent of Police, Panchkula and the statement of the petitioner as well as respondent No.5 was recorded. It is during this course it was established that the petitioner and respondent No.5 are businessmen and there is dispute about money transaction between them. There is no threat to the petitioner as alleged and the allegations made in the complaint were found false.

Considering the fact that the present petition has been filed without there being any cause and in any case, the matter in issue is altogether civil in nature being a money transaction, this Court finds that the present petition is misconceived.

Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed with costs of

Rs.10,000/- and the petitioner is directed to deposit the amount of costs with the Haryana State Legal Services Authority, Chandigarh and to place the receipt of the same in the Registry.

August 25, 2015
'Yag Dutt'

(HARI PAL VERMA)
JUDGE