

CRM-M-22629 of 2017(O&M)
Date of Decision: 23.06.2017

Dev Kumar Gupta and others	Versus	...Petitioners
State of Punjab and others		...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARINDER SINGH SIDHU

Present: - Mr. Bhupinder Ghai, Advocate
for the petitioners.

HARINDER SINGH SIDHU, J.

Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that at the behest of respondents No.5 and 6, respondents No. 3 and 4 have been repeatedly harassing the petitioners. The petitioners have been repeatedly called to the Police Station Dhakuali, District Mohali without any reason. They are made to sit there for long hours though there is no case registered against them.

The limited prayer of the petitioners is that in case the petitioners are wanted in any case, the proper procedure as contemplated in Section 160 Cr.P.C. be followed.

In view of the above, without commenting on the merits of the case, this petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2 that in case the presence of the petitioners is required in connection with inquiry/investigation in any case, the proper procedure as contemplated in the Code of Criminal Procedure be followed.

June 23, 2017

Atul

(HARINDER SINGH SIDHU)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/ reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable:	Yes/No

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

CRM-M-22663 of 2017(O&M)

Date of Decision: 23.06.2017

Kulwant Kaur

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARINDER SINGH SIDHU

--

Present: - Mr. Bhupinder Ghai, Advocate for the petitioners.

-

HARINDER SINGH SIDHU, J.

Learned counsel for the petitioners states that the petitioner is a poor illiterate lady. Her son was desirous of joining army. Respondents No.6 and 7 promised her that they could help her son for recruitment in the Army, respondent No.7 is working in the Army. On that assurance, the petitioner paid them sum of Rs.1,35,000/-. However, despite repeated attempts, son of the petitioner could not be recruited in the Army. When the petitioner demanded her money back, respondents No.6 and 7 became inimical and have been repeatedly threatening her with dire consequences in case she insisted on getting her money back. It is alleged that a .12 bore gun was pointed towards the head of the son of the petitioner and he was told he would be eliminated and no case/complaint can be filed against them as respondent No.7 is working in the Army.

The petitioner and her son have been repeatedly representing before the respondents No.2 and 3 requesting that action be taken against respondents No.6 and 7. They filed a complaint on 27.05.2017 against respondents No.6 and 7, which was registered in the office of respondent No.2 on 30.05.2017 but no action thereon has been taken.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that at this stage he would be satisfied if a direction is issued to respondent No.2 to look into the matter and take a necessary action on the representation (Annexure P-1).