

113

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

**CRM-M No.4732 of 2017
Date of Decision: 15.02.2017**

PRITAM SINGH

.....Petitioner

Vs

UT CHD AND ORS

.....Respondents

CORAM: *HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH*

Present: Mr. H.S. Aujla, Advocate
for the petitioner.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

Petitioner seeks issuance of necessary directions to respondent Nos.2 and 3 for registration of FIR in respect of commission of cognizable offence by respondent No.5.

Petitioner alleged that on the basis of his complaint an inquiry was conducted by the Welfare Department, Punjab, where the complicity of respondent No.5 came to fore. The complaint made by the petitioner to respondent No.3 did not yield any positive response.

Notice of motion.

At this stage, Mr. Rajiv Sharma, Addl. P.P., U.T., Chandigarh accepts notice on behalf of respondent Nos.1 to 3.

There is no necessity of calling upon any response from the respondent Nos.1 to 3, as no order prejudicial to their interest is being passed at this stage.

In view of pleadings made by the petitioner, it would be lawful to direct respondent No.3 to have a fair glance on the representation of the petitioner and take lawful action in accordance with law in view of guidelines laid down in **Lalita Kumari vs. Govt. of U.P. (2014) 2 SCC (1).**

In order to arrive at *prima facie* conclusion, respondent No.3 can devise his own mechanism in order to ascertain the truth in the allegations made by the petitioner without being swayed away with any consideration or the observation, if any, made by this Court in the preceding paras.

Petition stands disposed of accordingly.

February 15, 2017

Atik

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether reportable

**(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE**

Yes/No

Yes/No