

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

CRM-M-24329 of 2016.

Decided on:-22.07.2016.

Balbir Kaur.

.....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA.

1. Whether reporters of local newspapers may be allowed to see judgment?
2. To be referred to reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

Present:- Mr. Inder Pal Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

HARI PAL VERMA, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in this petition filed under Section 482 Cr.PC is for issuance of a direction to respondents No.2 to 4 to expedite the investigation and submit the final report in case FIR No.66 dated 23.4.2016 under Section 302 read with Section 34 IPC registered at Police Station Sadar Tarn Taran, District Tarn Taran.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that though the FIR was registered on 23.4.2016, but there is no headway in the said FIR and the investigation is not being carried out. He further states that the petitioner is, rather, getting threats at the hands of the accused. He further states that for the relief claimed in the present petition, the petitioner has already approached respondent No.2 i.e. Senior Superintendent of Police, Tarn Taran

by way of representation dated 2.6.2016 (Annexure P-3), but no action has been taken thereon.

Notice of motion.

On asking of this Court, Mr. Kirat Singh Sidhu, DAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.

Let requisite number of copies of paper book be given to learned State counsel during the course of the day.

Though the petitioner has earlier approached this Court for the similar relief vide CRM-M-17869 of 2016, however, the same was dismissed as withdrawn as the petitioner had filed that petition at a very premature stage.

Again after a period of less than 2 months, the petitioner has filed the present petition for the same relief. Though there is no change in the circumstances, but taking into consideration the allegation that the petitioner is getting threats, this petition has been entertained.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and without commenting upon the merits of the case, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondent No.2 to look into the contents of representation (Annexure P-3) as regards threat perception and if satisfied, to take appropriate action in accordance with law.

July 22, 2016
Yag Dutt

(HARI PAL VERMA)
JUDGE