

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

113

CRM-M-23591-2016.

Ram Singh

.. Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Punjab and others

.. Respondent(s)

* * *

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE M.M.S.BEDI

* * *

PRESENT Mr.Dhawaljeet Dutta, Advocate, for the petitioner.

M.M.S. BEDI, J. (ORAL)

Petitioner had been named as accused by Manpreet Singh of having committed theft. Petitioner claims that matter was inquired into and report Annexure P1 was prepared regarding the innocence of the petitioner, but complainant Manpreet Singh has again filed a complaint against the petitioner and the petitioner is being harassed on being called to the Police Station time and again. Petitioner claims that he has submitted a representation to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Gurdaspur.

Notice to the Advocate General, Punjab.

On asking of the Court, notice has been accepted by Ms.H.K.Athwal, DAG, Punjab, present in the Court. Copy given.

Without expression of any opinion regarding the culpability of the petitioner or contents of Annexure P1, I am of the considered opinion that in case the petitioner is required in context to any complaint filed by Manpreet Singh, he is entitled to notice under Section 160 Cr.P.C.

This petition is disposed of with a direction that in case the petitioner is required for the purpose of any inquiry in context to the complaint filed by Manpreet Singh, provisions of Section 160 Cr.P.C., will be followed and he would be entitled to at least notice of 7 days for appearance before the concerned Inquiry Officer. In case any case is registered against the petitioner, it will be open to the petitioner to avail the remedy available under Section 438 Cr.P.C., in accordance with law.

This order will remain operative for a period of six months and will be applicable only in the circumstances mentioned hereinabove.

(M.M.S. BEDI)
JUDGE

July 15, 2016.