

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

CRM-M-37521-2015 (O&M)
Date of decision: 21.11.2016

NIHAL SINGH

..Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present : Mr. Vikas Gupta, Advocate for
Mr. Vivek Salathia, Advocate
for the petitioner (s).

Mr. Luvinder Sofat, AAG, Punjab

Mr. Vishal Goel, Advocate for
Mr. J.S. Thind, Advocate
for respondent No.5.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J. (Oral)

By way of present petition, the petitioner has sought the issuance of directions to respondent Nos.2 and 4 to make a fair and impartial investigation in the complaint submitted by him against respondent No.5; to initiate the proceedings under Section 182 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 66 of the Punjab Police Act against respondent No.5, who had furnished a false affidavit during the enquiry; and to set aside the enquiry report dated 28.05.2015 (Annexure P-5) as the same had been prepared on account of the pendency of CRM-M-16806 of 2015.

Respondent No.5 is daughter-in-law of the petitioner. On the similar complaint filed by the petitioner, FIR No.88 dated 19.02.2010,

registered under Sections 420, 465, 467, 469, 471 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, at Police Station Civil Lines, Amritsar, wherein the challan has already been filed and the trial is in progress. The learned counsel for the petitioner has not been able to indicate as to how the investigation conducted by the State is not fair or impartial.

Heard.

Keeping in view the fact that the complainant is the father-in-law of respondent No.5 in such like hostility there would always be tendency to enlarge the scope of FIR and to register multiple FIRs against each other. The quashing petition preferred by respondent No.5 has already been dismissed vide order dated 25.03.2015 (Annexure P-3) of this Court. The inquiry was conducted by ADGP (Crime), Punjab on the basis of which FIR was registered. In this view of the matter, the Court does not find any substance in the petition to grant the relief sought by the petitioner. Therefore, the same lacks merits.

Dismissed.

21.11.2016
ashok

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes / No

Whether reportable: Yes / No