

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

CRM-M-20093-2016

Date of decision: 20.09.2016

Bimla

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM:HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RITU BAHRI

Present: Mr. Balraj Gujjar, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Mahima Yashpal, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Surender Lamba, Advocate,
for respondent No.4.

Mr. Aditya Yadav, Advocate,
for respondent No.5.

Ritu Bahri, J.

The petitioner is seeking direction to respondent Nos. 1 and 2 to transfer the investigation in case FIR No.151 dated 06.05.2016, under Sections 354-B/376/451/506/511 IPC, Section 3 of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act (for short, 'SC & ST Act') and Section 8 of Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012 (for short, 'POCSO Act'), registered at Police Station, Sadar Dadri, District Bhiwani (Annexure P-2) and FIR No.188 dated 18.05.2016, under Sections 16 and 21 of POCSO Act, 2012, Section 166 (A) IPC and Sections 3/4 of

(Annexure P-3) from respondent No.3 to any other competent officer.

Upon notice, reply by Deputy Superintendent of Police, Dadri, on behalf of respondent Nos. 1 to 3, has been filed in Court. Same is taken on record. In the reply, it has been stated that during investigation in FIR No.188 dated 18.05.2016, the allegations levelled against the respondents have not been found to be true. Accordingly, a cancellation report has been prepared on 27.08.2016, which is pending before the Superintendent of Police for its approval.

In the second case i.e. FIR No.151 dated 06.05.2016, two accused have been arrested and charge-sheet has been filed against them. After investigation, other accused have been found innocent. It has been further clarified that there was no coordination between the Child Welfare Committee (CWC) and the District Child Protection Unit while sending the complaint to the Superintendent of Police, Bhiwani. The allegations levelled against respondent No.4 regarding taking of no action upon the complaint of the victim and pressurizing the victim to get the matter compromised have not been found to be true.

In view of the aforesaid reply filed by respondent Nos. 1 to 3, no direction is required to be given in this case.

Disposed of accordingly.

20.09.2016
ajp

(RITU BAHRI)
JUDGE

speaking/non-speaking : Yes/No
Reportable : Yes/No