

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

231

Criminal Misc. No.M-5988 of 2014 (O&M)

Date of decision: September 10, 2015

Ram Parkash Singh

....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE DAYA CHAUDHARY

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment? Yes/No
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not? Yes/No
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest? Yes/No

Present: Mr. Anureet Singh Sidhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Ritu Punj, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

Mr. Animesh Sharma, Advocate for respondent No.5.

DAYA CHAUDHARY, J.

The present petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for issuance of directions to the official respondents for taking action against the private respondents and to provide adequate security to the petitioner as private respondents are harassing him. A further prayer has also been made to decide the application filed by the petitioner, annexed as Annexure P-1 with the petition.

In response to notice of motion, separate replies on behalf of respondents No.1 to 4-State and respondent No.5 have been filed.

Learned State counsel, on the basis of reply, submits that the application filed by the petitioner has already been dismissed vide order dated 05.07.2014 (Annexure R-1/T). It has been mentioned in the aforesaid order of rejection that the allegations levelled by the petitioner in the application against private respondents are false and the parties have already filed civil suit before the competent Court which is under consideration. It has also been mentioned therein that there is no danger to breach of peace and no security is required in this matter.

In view of stand taken in the reply and keeping in view order dated 05.07.2014 (Annexure R-1/T), nothing remains in the present petition and the same has become infructuous.

Dismissed as having become infructuous.

(DAYA CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

September 10, 2015
sonia g.