

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

140

**CRM-M of 15757 of 2018
Date of decision: 19.4.2018**

AARTI MALHOTRA

.....petitioner

Versus

SENIOR SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE AND ORS

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Jatinder Kumar, Advocate for the petitioner.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J (oral)

Petitioner seeks issuance of necessary directions to the official respondents No.1 to 3 to act on the complaint of the petitioner in accordance with law.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in respect of cognizable offence, a comprehensive complaint dated 29.3.2018 was submitted before the Station House Officer, P.S. Sector 11, Chandigarh but no action was taken.. Thereafter, a complaint dated 3.4.2018 was also filed before Senior Superintendent of Police, Chandigarh.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of Court, Mr. Rajiv Sharma, Standing counsel for U.T.Chandigarh, accepts notice on behalf of the

respondents.

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 i.e. whether any cognizable offence has been committed or not, respondents No.1 and 3 are directed to look into the grievance of the petitioner. In case, any cognizable offence is found to have been committed, in such eventuality, respondent No.3 would be at liberty to act in accordance with law. If no such cognizable offence is found to have been committed, then the petitioner would be informed as per the parameters laid down in **Lalita Kumari v. Govt. of U.P. (2014) 2 SCC (1).**

Disposed of. .

**(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE**

April 19, 2018
anita

Whether reasoned/speaking

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No