

CRM-M-33461 of 2016 (O&M)

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

**CRM-M-33461 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of Decision: September 21, 2016.**

Manjit Kaur

.. Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Punjab and others

.. Respondent(s)

*** * ***

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

*** * ***

**PRESENT Mr.G.S.Bhasin, Advocate,
for the petitioner.**

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

Petitioner claims that Parkash Singh resident of village Burj Mehma, Tehsil and District Bathinda, was uncle (Fuffar) of the petitioner. He was living with his brother Gurdas Singh.

It is claimed that the petitioner's uncle was admitted in the hospital of Kailash Goel, at Bathinda, and when the petitioner had gone to meet her uncle, Davinder Singh along with unidentified persons was found present in the hospital and the petitioner was manhandled regarding which the petitioner submitted a complaint to the SHO, Police Station, Civil Lines, Bathinda, Annexure P2. Thereafter, on 29.7.2016, the petitioner came to know that Parkash Singh had died and respondent Nos.7 to 9 under suspicious circumstances were trying to cremate the dead body of Parkash Singh and as such, she moved an application in the Court for post mortem examination. A copy of the application

CRM-M-33461 of 2016 (O&M)

submitted to the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Bathinda and the order passed thereon, has been placed on record as Annexure P3.

In above said circumstances, the petitioner apprehends that during the illness of Parkash Singh and his admission period in the hospital, Davinder Singh, Jaswinder Singh and other private respondents have caused injuries on the person of Parkash Singh as has been told by Jagsir Singh and it had been told by Parkash Singh that Davinder Singh and Jaswinder Singh have got some papers signed and executed by playing deception upon him and also got prepared a forged Will.

In view of above said allegations, the petitioner seeks registration of FIR against the private respondents regarding which she has submitted representation Annexure P1 dated 27.8.2016. Prima facie, it appears to be a dispute pertaining to the inheritance of property of Parkash Singh. The commission of any cognizable offence is also a debatable issue on perusal of complaint Annexure P1. It is expected that the grievance of the petitioner may be inquired into.

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.

This petition is disposed of in limine with a direction to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Bathinda, to consider the averments in Annexure P1. It will be appreciated in case the representation Annexure P1, is looked into within a period of three

CRM-M-33461 of 2016 (O&M)

months after the receipt of a certified copy of the order.

Nothing said in this order will be deemed to be an expression of opinion regarding the authenticity of the averments or the allegations in the complaint or this petition.

(M.M.S. BEDI)
JUDGE

September 21, 2016.
rka

Whether speaking / reasoned
Whether Reportable:

Yes / No
Yes / No