

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

CRL. MISC. No.M-32462 OF 2016
DATE OF DECISION : 29TH NOVEMBER, 2016

Satpal Singh

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab & others

.... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A. B. CHAUDHARI

* * * *

Present : Mr. Kanwalvir Singh Kang, Advocate for the petitioner.
 Mr. Shilesh Gupta, Additional Advocate General, Punjab.
 Mr. Atul Goyal, Advocate for respondent No.5.

* * * *

A. B. CHAUDHARI, J. (ORAL)

In response to this petition there is a reply/affidavit filed by Rupinder Kaur, SRA, PPS, Assistant Commissioner of Police (West), Ludhiana. I quote the relevant portion thereof which reads thus:

“21 That the contents of para no.21 of the petition are admitted that by filing repeated complaints before various authorities, respondent no.5 is trying to misuse the process of law but now no new enquiry on the complaint of respondent no.5 Annexure P-19 is being conducted as mentioned above.

22. That the contents of para no.22 of the petition relate to the orders dated 01.04.2008 issued by the DGP in which it has been directed that there cannot be second enquiry in

respect of the same case and the same are matter of record.

Xxx Xxx Xxx ”

The grievance made by learned counsel for the petitioner about the repeated enquiries etc. is thus taken care of in view of the categorical statement made in para 21 above. In that view of the matter, nothing further has to be done.

With reference to Annexure P-22, the State counsel on instructions from ASI Sapinder Singh, submits that the same statement made in para 21 above would apply.

In that view of the matter nothing further has to be done in this petition. Disposed of accordingly.

The parties are at liberty to take their own remedies, available in accordance with law.

29TH NOVEMBER, 2016
'raj'

(A. B. CHAUDHARI)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	:	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	:	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No.</i>