

120
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-21580-2016 (O&M)
Date of Decision: June 22, 2016

Balwinder Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARINDER SINGH SIDHU

--

Present: - Mr.Sanjiv Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

-

HARINDER SINGH SIDHU, J.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner is not an accused in FIR No.125 dated 11.6.2016 under Sections 379, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC registered at Police Station Kotwali, District Patiala. However, he is being repeatedly called to the Police Station, made to sit there for hours together and threatened with false implication in the case. It is submitted that in this regard, the petitioner has already made an application to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Patiala, but the same has not been considered.

Section 160 of the Code of Criminal Procedure contemplates that if a Police Officer making an investigation of a case requires attendance before himself of any person, who appears to be acquainted with the facts and circumstances of the case, then the said person is required to be intimated through a notice in writing, which the Ld. Counsel states, is not being done by the Investigating Officer.

In these circumstances, without commenting on the merits of the matter, the petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondent – State that in case attendance of the petitioner is required for the purpose of investigation, the provisions of Section 160 Cr.P.C. be complied with.

Regarding the other averments raised in the petition that the offence involving the Income Tax Department officials, cannot be investigated by the local police, the petitioner is at liberty to make a representation before the Senior Superintendent of Police, Patiala, which may be looked into in accordance with law.

June 22, 2016
gian

(HARINDER SINGH SIDHU)
JUDGE