

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

CRM-M No.26981 of 2017

Date of Decision: 20.02.2018

Puneet Tripathi

. . . Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

. . . Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARMINDER SINGH MADAAN

Present: Mr. K.S. Brar, Advocate for
Mr. D.S. Sobti, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ramandeep Sandhu, Sr. DAG, Punjab
for respondent Nos.1 and 3.

Mr. Dinesh Nagra, Advocate for
for respondent Nos.5 to 7..

Mr. Gautam, Advocate for
Mr. Rajiv Sharma, Advocate
Addl. P.P. for UT Chandigarh
for respondent No.2.

Harminster Singh Madaan, J. (Oral)

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that dispute has been amicably settled between the petitioner and private respondent Nos. 5 to 7. However, the grouse of the petitioner is against respondent no. 4 Sub Inspector Bharat Bhushan, who according to the petitioner had tortured him (petitioner) and some action be taken against said respondent No.4- Sub Inspector Bharat Bhushan, who is present in the Court, denies such allegations.

CRM-M No.26981 of 2017

Learned State counsel has drawn my attention to the written reply submitted by DSP, Sub Division Kharar, District Mohali, on behalf of respondent Nos. 1 and 3 in which it is contended that on 14th July, 2017 both the parties were called to the police station as it was a matrimonial dispute, efforts were made to amicably settle the same. But, since the parties remained adamant, security proceedings under Section 107/151 Cr.P.C. were initiated against the petitioner. He was produced before Sub Divisional Magistrate, Kharar on that very day, where he was granted bail and on 15th July, 2017 information was received that petitioner was admitted in hospital. Police party went there to record his statement but they came to know that petitioner had been discharged from the hospital. Efforts were made to contact him telephonically, but to no effect.

In view of the matter being compromised between the petitioner and respondent Nos.5 to 7 and the version given in the written reply on behalf of respondents No.1 and 3, the petition stands disposed of.

However, the petitioner can take recourse to the remedies available to him under law as regards the alleged torture at the hands of Sub Inspector Bharat Bhushan, respondent No.4.

[HARMINDER SINGH MADAN]
JUDGE

February 20, 2018
sachin

Whether Speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No