

110

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

CRM-M No.10316 of 2018
Date of Decision: 13.03.2018

Tarjinder Singh

....Petitioner

Vs

State of UT Chandigarh and others

.....Respondents

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

Present: Ms. Satpreet Grewal Kapila, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J.(Oral)

Grievance of the petitioner is that despite recording his statement by the police vide Annexure P-8 in pursuance of representation dated 18.09.2016 made before the Inspector General of Police in Sector-9, Chandigarh, no action has been taken by the police so far.

It appears that there is no complaint filed by the petitioner under Section 154 Cr.P.C. before the concerned police station.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of Court, Mr. Rajesh Sharma, A.P.P., UT, Chandigarh, accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3.

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

At this stage, without meaning anything on the merits of the case, it would be just and appropriate to obligate respondent No.2 to look into the representation and if any cognizable offence is found to have been committed, follow up action be taken. If no such cognizable offence is found to have been committed, then the complainant-petitioner be informed as per the parameters laid down in **Lalita Kumari v. Govt. of U.P. (2014) 2 SCC (1).**

Disposed of.

13.03.2018

jyoti

**(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No