

202-3

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

CRM-M No.14665 of 2017

Date of Decision: 08.02.2018

Sukhwinder Kaur

. . . Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

. . . Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDIP AHLUWALIA

Present: Mr. S.S. Brar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Rajni Gupta, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. G.S. Sandhu, Advocate
for respondent No.6/complainant.

Mr. P.S. Sidhu, Advocate
for respondent No.8.

Sudip Ahluwalia, J. (Oral)

Reply by way of short affidavit of Munish Kapoor, Regional
Passport Officer, Chandigarh, on behalf of respondent No.8 filed in the
Court is taken on record.

Heard.

During the course of arguments, learned counsel for the
petitioner placed on record transcript of telephone conversation taken
place between petitioner and one Avijit Arora as Annexure P-7.

CRM-M No.14665 of 2017

The grievance of the petitioner is that her complaint submitted to respondent No.4-Commissioner of Police, Ludhiana was not properly looked into substantially for ulterior motives.

This Court has gone through the aforesaid complaint (Annexure P-1). The contents therein as well as substance of the allegations do disclose incidence of certain developments at Raikot and Doraha, both of which admittedly fall outside the territorial jurisdiction of respondent No.4, who in the circumstances correctly observed in his report that the petitioner is advised to approach the officials of District Ludhiana (Rural) and District Khanna at Raikot.

There is nothing to indicate that thereafter the petitioner in any manner approached either of the aforesaid authorities whom she has not even impleaded in the present case.

On the contrary, she has approached this Court by making even the Regional Passport Officer, Chandigarh (respondent No.8) as party against whom no tangible relief has been claimed.

The contentions made in the application lest it cause any prejudice to the petitioner, otherwise are not referred to in detail, but they surely are in conflict with the pending of FIR involving her family members in the neighbouring District of Barnala, and SSP of that District has been impleaded as respondent No.3, instead of the equivalent officer as specifically suggested in the report of respondent No.4.

CRM-M No.14665 of 2017

In the totality of the circumstances, therefore, this Court finds no reason to intervene in the matter at this stage.

The present petition thus, stands dismissed with liberty to the petitioner to approach the competent authority as suggested by the Commissioner of Police in his report dated 24.07.2017.

The original documents stated to have been delivered by the petitioner to respondent No.4 may be returned to her, if any such request is made before the authority concerned.

[SUDIP AHLUWALIA]
JUDGE

February 08, 2018
sachin

Whether Speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No