

CRM-M-2047 of 2018

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

CRM-M-2047 of 2018  
Date of decision: 31.07.2018

Brijpal Singh

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMENDRA JAIN**

Present: - None for the petitioner.  
Mr. Vikramjit Singh, Addl. A.G., Haryana.  
Mr. Kuldeep Tiwari, Advocate, for respondent No.4.  
Mr. Surinder Gaur, Advocate, for respondent No.5

**RAMENDRA JAIN, J. (ORAL)**

Respective vakalatnamas on behalf of respondents No.4 and 5, filed in Court, are taken on record.

Through this petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C., prayer has been made for issuance of direction to the official respondents to conduct proper and impartial investigation in the matter and take appropriate steps by ensuring care and protection of the children who are studying in school and file status report in case FIR No.299 dated 26.10.2017 registered under Section 82 of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act') at Police Station Bhiwani Civil Lines, District Bhiwani.

Learned State counsel, assisted by learned counsel for respondents No.4 and 5, drawing the attention of this Court towards affidavit of S.S. Bhorla, HPS, Superintendent of Police, Bhiwani, urged that by two independent bodies i.e. one by the police and other by the District Child Protection Officer, inquiries were done in the complaint. During the

CRM-M-2047 of 2018

course of inquiry, it revealed that alleged punishment of sit ups was not given by the Science teacher to the son of the petitioner, rather he was only made to stand for some time. Other complaint given by the petitioner to the District Child Protection Officer, Bhiwani, who is a Nodal Officer for implementation of the Act and the Rules made thereunder, was inquired by five-member committee, consisting of one police official (Child Welfare Officer of the Police Station). During inquiry, it was found that son of the petitioner was denied admission by respondent No.5 in NCC due to physical issues. Therefore, being aggrieved, petitioner manhandled and threatened respondent No.5 with dire consequences. Petitioner also runs an educational society and used to interfere in school matters. Three children of the petitioner are getting free education in the school of respondent No.4 under the Right to Education Act despite the fact that he is an Advocate. The Principal of the school had also got conducted an inquiry in this regard and found the allegations of the petitioner false. Thus, the petitioner had lodged complaint against the Principal also, besides respondent No.5. During inquiry, no evidence was adduced to indicate the complicity of respondents No.4 and 5 of giving corporal punishment to the son of the petitioner. Therefore, cancellation report dated 01.01.2018 was prepared observing that no offence under the Act was found to have been committed and the allegations levelled in the FIR were false.

In view of above, petition is dismissed on merit as well as for want of prosecution.

**(Ramendra Jain)**  
**Judge**

**July 31, 2018**  
**R.S.**

Whether speaking/reasoned      Yes/No

Whether reportable      Yes/No.