

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

**CRM No.M-32246 of 2015 (O&M)
Date of Decision: September 15, 2016**

Ranjodh Singh

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr.Preetinder S. Ahluwalia, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr.Neeraj Sharma, Asstt. Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondent-State.

Mr.Atul Goyal, Advocate
for respondent No.5.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for issuance of appropriate directions to the Investigating Agency not to conduct multiple enquiry in the same matter which has already been enquired into five times since multiple enquiries on the same subject matter run contrary to the statutory provisions of Cr.P.C. and violates the directions issued by respondent No.2 and it is further prayed that sixth enquiry on the same subject matter having been initiated before respondent No.4 be stayed during the pendency of the present petition.

Notice of motion was issued and learned State counsel as well as learned counsel for respondent No.5 appeared and contested the petition and replies were also filed.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties as well as learned State counsel and have gone through the record.

In the reply filed by way of affidavit of Assistant Commissioner

of Police, Sahnewal on behalf of respondents No.1 to 4, it is stated that earlier only two enquiries were conducted but the parties were not satisfied with each other. It is stated that although the parties have moved applications but in view of the earlier enquiry, the Deputy Commissioner has recommended to file cancellation report in the FIR and no further enquiry is being conducted.

It is specifically stated that the application of the petitioner dated 03.10.2015 as well as application dated 19.08.2015 moved by respondent No.5, have been filed by the Deputy Commissioner of Police, Ludhiana, in view of the reply filed by the State.

In view of the reply filed by the State that no further enquiry is being conducted and further, the cancellation report has submitted before the Illaqa Magistrate, who has asked for further investigation in the matter, I find that no further action is required in the present petition. The enquiry has already been filed, therefore, the present petition has rendered infructuous.

Accordingly, the present petition is disposed of as having rendered infructuous, keeping in view the reply of the State and further in view of the fact that in the cancellation report, the Illaqa Magistrate has ordered further investigation.

However, it is made clear that Investigating Officer can comply with the order of Illaqa Magistrate by making further investigation, as per law.

September 15, 2016
Vgulati

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes
No