

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Date of decision: 30.09.2016

1. CRM-M-34916-2016

M/S Raghuvir Singh Rajesh Kumar Gas Agency,
Vill.&P.O.Bichpari, Teshil Gohana, District Sonipat

...Petitioner(s)

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

2. CRM-M-34923-2016

M/s Kissan Gas Service, Barwala, Dist.Hisar

...Petitioner(s)

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

3. CRM-M-34932-2016

Bharti Gas Janseva, Hansi, Dist.Hisar

...Petitioner(s)

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. G.S.Gopera, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Jitendra Chauhan, J. (Oral)

This Court vide order dated 07.09.2016, disposed of identical
bunch of petitions and passed the following order:-

“This order of mine shall dispose of 17
cases bearing CRM-M-Nos.28009,27847, 27870, 27972,
28019, 28020, 28027, 28035, 28037, 29462,29465,29466,
29467, 29472, 29476, 30179, 30235,30289 and 30363 of
2016.

The petitioners have claimed that respondent
No.3 has defrauded despite lodging the complaint. FIR
has not been lodged.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of State
of Haryana has pointed out that there are many similar
cases pending against respondent No.3 and the Director

General of Police, Haryana has referred the matter to the Special Crime Branch Madhuban/Gurgaon. He informs that the present cases will also be referred to the Special Crime Branch, Madhuban/Gurgaon and undertakes that the action will be taken thereon within two months.

In view of the above, the aforementioned petitions are disposed of with a direction to the State of Haryana and Punjab to refer the aforementioned cases to the Special Crime Branch, Madhuban/Gurgaon for further action. The action be taken within a period of two months.”

Notice of motion.

At the asking of the Court Mr. Saurabh Mohunta, DAG, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State of Haryana. A complete copy of the paper book has been furnished to the learned counsel, in the Court.

At this stage, Mr. Aditya Sanghi, Advocate causes representation on behalf of respondent No.3.

Heard.

Though the petitioners were different but the respondents were same and claim raised by the petitioners was also same.

Accordingly, the present petition stands disposed of in the same terms.

September 30, 2016

vanita

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned :
Whether Reportable :

Yes	No
Yes	No

