

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

**CRM-M-25158 of 2013
DECIDED ON: April 21, 2016**

PRITHVI SINGH

....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA & ORS

....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

- 1. Whether Reporters of local papers 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?**

Present: Mr. K.K. Chaudhary, Advocate for
Mr. Sanjiv Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr.K.S. Pannu, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. PPS Duggal, Advocate for respondents No. 4 and 5.

JASPAL SINGH, J (ORAL)

Through this petition preferred under Section 482 Cr.P.C., Prithvi Singh-petitioner has sought indulgence of this Court for taking action against the respondents for preparation of false record/report and quashing of order dated April 29, 2013 (Annexure P-8).

2. Undoubtedly, representation dated December 12, 2012 (Annexure P-6) was moved to Deputy Commissioner of Police, Sirsa for getting an inquiry conducted as well as to take action against the officials of electricity wing. Since, no action was taken on Annexure P-6 by the Deputy Commissioner of Police, Sirsa, the petitioner knocked the door of

this Court vide CRM-M-924 of 2013, which was disposed of vide order dated January 11, 2013 with the direction to respondent No.2-Deputy Commissioner of Police, Sirsa to consider the representation (Annexure P-6) moved by the petitioner and to take appropriate action thereon as per law.

3. In pursuance of order dated January 11, 2013 passed by this Court, the matter was got inquired into by respondent No.2-Deputy Commissioner of Police, Sirsa from the Executive Engineer/OP, City Division DHBVN, Sirsa and a report was submitted in this regard. During that inquiry, the petitioner was found guilty for the commission of theft of electricity, vide report (Annexure P-8).

4. During the course of arguments, it has also been unfolded by the learned counsel for respondents No. 4 and 5 that the penalty imposed upon the petitioner has also been deposited by him without any protest and no appeal has been filed against the said order. If any, action has been initiated by the electricity department, the petitioner can have recourse to the remedies available under the act and not to approach this Court time and again just to quench the ego existing in between the private persons i.e. petitioner and Dharampal.

5. This Court does not find any merit in the instant petition. As such, the same is dismissed.

6. However, the petitioner is at liberty to have recourse to the remedies available under the law.

April 21, 2016
sonika

(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE