

115

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

CRM-M No.15814 of 2018
Date of Decision: 19.04.2018

Sapna Mahajan

....Petitioners

Vs

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

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

Present: Dr. Rau P.S. Girwar, 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 29.05.2017 was filed before Director General of Police. The same was supplemented by statement of fact dated 19.06.2017. Complaint dated 26.09.2017 was also submitted before the Station House Officer, P.S. Ambala City through speed post. Reminder was also sent to SHO with acknowledgment but no action has been taken till date.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of Court, Mr. S.P. Singh, D.A.G., Haryana, 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.2 and 4 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.4 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.

19.04.2018

jyoti

**(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No