

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

COCP 429/2017

DATE OF DECISION: 12.7.2018

Gurpreet Singh

.....Petitioner

v

Daljit Singh Virk, SHO

.....Respondent

Coram:- Hon'ble Mr. Justice Jaswant Singh

Present:- Mr. Shakti Mehta, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mrs. Anju Sharma Kaushik, DAG Punjab
Mr. Kanwalvir Singh Kang, Advocate for the respondent.

Jaswant Singh, J. (Oral)

Petitioner has filed instant contempt alleging non-compliance of directions given by this Court vide order dated 17.8.2016 passed in CRM-M No. 24892/2016.

CRM-M 24892/2016 was filed by the petitioner with the allegations that some private persons had taken money from him on the pretext of sending him and his family members abroad for gainful employment. However, he was sent to Singapore on a 10 day visa. Thereafter, petitioner moved complaint against those private persons for alleged cheating and fraud committed with him and when no action was taken by police authorities, the said petition was filed which was disposed of by this Court vide order dated 17.8.2016 with the directions to respondent herein to look into the matter and in case it was found that any action was required to take whatever action he deemed necessary as per law.

In the instant contempt it is alleged that in terms of order dated 17.8.2016 no action was being taken by the respondent.

Upon notice, reply by way of affidavit dated 8.10.2017 has been filed by the respondent stating therein that on receipt of complaint

made by the petitioner the investigation was carried out and recommendations dated 3.10.2016 (R-3) made for registration of FIR under Sections 406/420 IPC. The said recommendation was accepted by the DSP, however SSP Patiala vide letter dated 27.10.2016 raised certain objections to the inquiry report and also raised specific points for further investigation vide Annexure R-5. The objections raised by the SSP Patiala were answered by the respondent vide communication dated 8.11.2016 (R-6). In the meantime the accused party also filed a cross complaint and Incharge Complaint cell clubbed both the complaints together for detailed investigation. SP (HQ)Patiala vide letter dated 4.3.2017 (R-8) recommended registration of FIR against accused persons. The said report was approved by D.A.(Legal) on 3.7.2017 (R-9). On the said report, SSP Patiala again directed SP(HQ)Patiala for further verification of facts. Thereafter, the matter is under investigation. Thus, it is submitted that the complaint made by the petitioner is being investigated and necessary action taken as per law.

In view of the reply filed by respondent, it is apparent that the complaint made by the petitioner is being investigated and necessary action would be taken, if deemed necessary by the appropriate authorities. Hence, no further action is warranted in this contempt petition. Disposed of.

Rule is discharged.

12.07.2018
joshi

(Jaswant Singh)
Judge