

110

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

CRM-M No.17088 of 2018

Date of Decision: 25.04.2018

SURINDER PAL SINGH

.....Petitioner

vs.

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present: Ms. Promila Nain, Advocate
for the petitioner.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

Petitioner seeks issuance of necessary directions to respondent No.3 (wrongly typed as respondent No.2) to look into the complaints (Annexure P-5 & P-6) and to take necessary action in accordance with law.

Petitioner claims himself to be a retired employee, whose retiral dues have been grabbed by the private respondents under the garb of some agreement to sell dated 29.09.2016.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that complaint made by the petitioner was inquired into by the SP Headquarter, SP Traffic/SSP and legal opinion was also given by the District Attorney for lodging a criminal case, but no action has been taken till date.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of Court, Mr. Hittan Nehra, Addl. A.G., Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of respondent Nos.1 to 3. Let requisite copies of the petition be supplied to him by learned counsel for the petitioner during course of the day.

In view of nature of order, which this Court proposes to pass there is no necessity of calling upon reply at this stage.

At this stage, without meaning anything on merits of the case, respondent No.3 is directed to look into the grievance of the petitioner in accordance with law. If some cognizable offence is found to have been committed, respondent No.5 can be asked to act in accordance with law. If no cognizable offence is found to have been committed, in such eventuality the petitioner can be informed as per parameters laid down in **Lalita Kumari vs. Govt. of U.P. (2014) 2 SCC (1).**

Petition stands disposed of accordingly.

April 25, 2018

Atik

**(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No