

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

**CRM-M No.9439 of 2017(O&M)
Date of Decision: 20.03.2017**

Harwinderjit Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

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

Present:Mr. Ish Puneet Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J.(ORAL)

Petitioner seeks issuance of necessary direction to respondent No.1 for protection of his legal rights from being invaded by respondent No.3.

Petitioner had purchased immovable property from respondent No.3 vide registered sale deed dated 30.06.2016 and thereafter, respondent No.3 was allegedly involved in an act of re-possessing the same. Precisely, for the grievance in question, the petitioner has already moved a representation to respondent No.1 on 11.07.2016 followed by a complaint to respondent No.2 on 11.10.2016. The aforesaid representation and complaint are statedly pending before respondents No.1 and 2. Thereafter, one more representation was filed before respondent No.1.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Shilesh Gupta, Addl,

AG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the State.

In view of nature of order which this Court proposes to pass, there is no necessity to file reply as no order prejudicial to the interest of the parties is being passed.

This petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.1 to have a fair look on the grievance of the petitioner. If any cognizable offence is found to have been committed, then in such eventuality, respondent No.2 can be asked to act in accordance with law. If no cognizable offence is found to have been committed by respondent No.3, then the complainant be informed as per parameters laid down in **Lalita Kumari v. Govt. of U.P. (2014) 2 SCC (1).**

20.03.2017
prince

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether Reasoned/Speaking

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No