

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

CRM-M No.16319 of 2017
Date of Decision: 10.05.2017

INDERJIT SINGH REHAL

-PETITIONER

VS

STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS

-RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Kunal Dawar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Petitioner seeks issuance of necessary directions to respondents No.3 and 4 in the context of protection of his life, liberty and personal properties from being invaded by private respondents No.6 to 8.

Precisely for the grievance in question, petitioner has already filed a complaint before respondent No.5 and a representation before respondent No.3.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the grievance of the petitioner would be satisfied at this stage if necessary directions are issued to respondent No.3 to look into the grievance of the petitioner which is pending before him in the form of representation.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Ripudaman, A.A.G., Haryana accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.1 to 5.

At this stage, in view of nature of order which this Court proposes to pass, there is no necessity of filing any reply to the petition as no order prejudicial to interest of any of the party is being passed.

This petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.5 to look into the grievance of the petitioner in context of his pending complaint. If some cognizable offence is found to have been committed, then the concerned SHO can be obligated to act in accordance with law and if no such offence is found to have been committed, then the petitioner can be informed in view of parameters as laid down in **Lalita Kumari v. Govt. of U.P. (2014) 2 SCC (1).**

10.05.2017
jyoti Y.

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No