

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

141

**CRM-M of 15793 of 2018
Date of decision: 19.4.2018**

Shahnaz Ameer

.....petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present: Mr. G.S.Bawa, Advocate for the petitioner.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J (oral)

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that in respect of cognizable offence, petitioner filed a complaint before respondent No.3 on 16.1.2018 (Annexure P-2) in respect of incident of manhandling. Petitioner relied upon her Medico Legal Report (Annexure P-3) prepared by the doctor. Statement of the petitioner was recorded by the police officials on 16.1.2018 and only DDR was recorded. Petitioner has also filed a representation before respondent No.2 on 13.2.2018 (Annexure P-6) but no action has been taken on the same so far.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of Court, Mr. Sandeep Kumar, DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of official respondents. Let requisite copies of petition be supplied to him by learned counsel for the petitioner during the course of the day.

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.2 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