

116

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

CRM-M No.16619 of 2018
Date of Decision: 23.04.2018

Surinder Kumar Verma

....Petitioner

Vs

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

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

Present: Mr. K.S. Jetley, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J.(Oral)

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that on 23.01.2018, a complaint was made to the Private Secretary to Government of Haryana, Urban Local Bodies, Chandigarh with a copy to respondents No.2 and 3 but no action has been taken till date.

Learned counsel further contends that under Section 154 Cr.P.C., Incharge/S.H.O., Police Station is bound to act in accordance with law in case cognizable offence is found to have been committed as per complaint filed by the complainant.

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, it would be just and appropriate to direct respondents No.2 and 3 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.

It is made clear that while taking such a decision, respondents No.2 and 3 shall act in accordance with law without being influenced by any statement of fact made hereinabove.

23.04.2018

jyoti

**(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No