

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

Criminal Misc. No. M-40262 of 2014

Date of Decision:-08.02.2016

Balwinder Singh

..Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA

1. *Whether reporters of local newspapers may be allowed to see judgment?*
2. *To be referred to reporters or not?*
3. *Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?*

Present:- None for the petitioner.

Mr. Sultan Singh Singh, DAG, Punjab,
for respondents No. 1 to 4.

Mr. Ranbir Singh Sekhon, Advocate
for respondent No.5.

HARI PAL VERMA J.(Oral)

Prayer made in the present petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is for issuance of direction to respondent No. 2 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioner and further directing the respondents especially respondent No.3 and 4 not to harass, humiliate the petitioner as well as his family members by frequently calling them in the police station/police post.

There is no representation on behalf of the petitioner.

Reply dated 11.02.2015 on behalf of respondents No.1 to 4 has already been filed in the Court. Para No.1 of preliminary submission of the reply reads as under:-

The brief facts of the present case are that respondent No.5 had moved an application before SSP, Ferozepur

against the petitioner with the allegations that he used to visit Nanaksar Gurudwara where he met with the petitioner and his wife Surinder Kaur Sandhu. Petitioner and his wife promised with respondent No.5 that they will arrange the marriage of respondent No.5 with sister of Surinder Kaur namely Charanjit Kaur who is permanent resident of Canada and for said purpose they had obtained Rs.7 lacs and passport from respondent No.5. But after that petitioner and his wife neither arranged the marriage of petitioner with Charanjit Kaur nor returned his amount and passport. Copy of application is attached herewith as Annexure R-1/T. Said application marked to Superintendent of Police (H), Ferozepur and during enquiry same was found as false and application of respondent no.5 has been consigned in record room. Copy of enquiry report is attached herewith as annexure R-2/T. Neither any case is registered against the petitioner nor petitioner is required by answering respondents in connection with any case.

Learned counsel for the State submits that on the complaint moved by respondent No.5, namely, Gurpreet Singh, the matter has been enquired into and during enquiry, the allegation made in the complaint were found to be false. Furthermore, the parties were summoned with regard to enquiry, but both the parties have not come present for recording of their statements before the enquiry officer and it was found that the parties are not interested in the inquiry proceedings.

In view of the reply dated 11.02.2015 filed on behalf of respondents No.1 to 4 as well as enquiry report dated 29.12.2014 (Annexure R-2/T), no further orders are required to be passed in the present case and present petition is disposed of as such.

08.02.2016
Anjal

(HARI PAL VERMA)
JUDGE