

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

**CRM-M No.15366 of 2013
Date of Decision: 11.01.2016.**

Ajaib Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab & Ors.

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

Present: Mr. A.S. Barnala, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajpreet Singh Sidhu, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. K.R. Dhawan, Advocate,
for respondents No.4 to 10.

1. *Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers 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?*

JASPAL SINGH, J. (ORAL)

This is a petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. praying for directing the respondents to protect the life and liberty of the petitioner, his son Balwinder Singh and other family members of his family at the hands of respondents No.4 to 10.

In response to notice of motion, reply has been filed on behalf of official respondents No.1 to 3, 11 & 12 and clearly stating that complaint No.290 dasti dated 17.04.2013 was filed by respondent No.5 against the petitioner and his son.

The enquiry was conducted and all the allegations were found to be false. The preliminary submission No.2 is relevant in this regard which reads as under:

“That it has been found that a complaint No.290-Desti dated 17.04.2013 was submitted by respondent No.5 against petitioner and his sons in connection with enquiry of the said complaint, both the parties were summoned at Police Station Lohian on 24.04.2013, where both the parties effected a compromise with the intervention of their respectable and without any pressure from the concerned police officials. It is submitted that as per the said compromise, the petitioner undertook to give some portion of their land to his grandson namely Sandeep Singh, who is in custody of respondent No.4 being his mother and natural guardian after the death of his father Balwinder Singh. As per the said compromise, the petitioner also undertook to return gold articles and pay maintenance to the respondent No.4. However, subsequently, petitioner in order to deny the said compromise deal, he created a false version and filed the present petition while leveling vague allegations in his complaint submitted to the concerned police for seeking action against respondent No.4 to 11. The

said complaint was also thoroughly enquired by the DSP, Sub Division, Shahkot district Jalandhar Rural and during enquiry it has been found that the petitioner was never pressurized to put his signatures on the compromise deed dated 20.04.2013 executed by him with the opposite party. The DSP, Sub Division, Shahkot district Jalnadhar Rural submitted his enquiry report dated 06.08.2013 to the answering respondent, which recommending the filing the said complaint in office and the same was approved by the answering respondent. Hence, this petition deserves dismissal from this Hon'ble Court.”

In view of the aforesaid contents, the instant petition has been rendered infructuous and same is disposed of accordingly.

January 11, 2016*Ankur***(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE**