

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

**CRM-M-14086-2018 (O&M)
Date of decision : 28.11.2018**

Sushma Rani

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. V.K.Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms.Sunint Kaur, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Shiv Kumar Sharma, Advocate
for respondents no. 6 and 7.

Mr. Sukhdeep Singh Sidhu, Advocate
for respondent No. 8.

1. *Whether the Reporters of local newspaper may be allowed to see the judgment ?*
2. *To be referred to the Reporter or not.*
3. *Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?*

KULDIP SINGH J. (ORAL)

Reply by way of affidavit on behalf of respondent No. 8 filed in Court today is taken on record.

Heard.

Petitioner seeks direction to respondents No. 2 to 4 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioner as well as his family members at the hands of respondents No. 5 to 8 and further to decide the representation dated 14.2.2017 (Annexure P-1) moved by the petitioner to conduct the fair and proper investigation of the case FIR No. 150 dated 04.07.2016 under Sections 420, 406 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, registered at Police Station Kotwali, Bathinda, District Bathinda.

It comes out that two sons of the petitioner namely Munish Garg and Rajnish Garg are involved in a case. They have not come to the Court. Petitioner claims that they are innocent, therefore, she moved the aforesaid representation dated 14.2.2017 (Annexure P-1) before the police authority. It is further contended that police has not conducted the inquiry.

On the other hand, learned counsel for respondent has produced the copy of the case status from the system showing that challan in the FIR was presented before filing of the present petition which was concealed. Now the case is pending for prosecution evidence. Once the trial is going on this Court cannot interfere in the trial. If the petitioner has some defence on behalf of her sons, she can always produce the same in defence before the trial Court.

It being so, no direction in this case is required to be issued in exercising the powers under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

Dismissed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

28.11.2018
preeti

Whether speaking / reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable:	No