

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

**CRM-M No. 6730 of 2015
Decided on: 02.03.2015**

Shanti Devi & Others . . .Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab & Others . . .Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Krishan Singh Dadwal, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Arshdeep Singh Kler, DAG Punjab.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

Learned counsel for the petitioners states that FIR No.74 dated 20.04.2013, under Sections 420, 294, 295, 506 IPC, Police Station Dasuya and FIR No.86 dated 02.05.2013, under Sections 420, 506 IPC, Police Station Dasuya were registered against number of persons including the petitioners. In both the aforesaid cases, reports under Section 173 Cr.P.C. have already been submitted.

Despite the status as aforesaid, the police of Police Station, Dasuya has started repeated enquiries in the same allegations which are statedly against instructions dated 01.04.2008, issued by the respondent No.2, wherein it was specifically circulated to all the police heads that no repeated

enquiry should be made into the same allegations. Certain guidelines were also issued.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Arshdeep Singh Kler, DAG, Punjab accepts notice.

In view of nature of order, which the Court proposes to pass, there is no necessity of filing any response. Since no order prejudicial to the interest of private respondents is being passed, therefore, their presence is also not necessary at this stage.

Let the petitioners move a detailed representation to respondent No.2, highlighting the factum of registration of cases against them along with others and the issuance of instructions by the Director General of Police in the context of prohibiting repeated enquiries in the same allegations.

In the event of filing such representation by the petitioners within a period of 10 days, respondent No.2 would be obligated to decide the same by giving proper opportunities to the parties, of course by way of speaking order.

Respondent No.2 is also required to see feasibility of passing any restraint order, thereby preventing the petitioners from facing vagaries of unwarranted repeated enquiries.

Petition stands disposed of accordingly.

[Raj Mohan Singh]
Judge

02.03.2015
sachin