

Rahul Bhatt

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR MITTAL

Present: Mr. Rajiv Goel, Advocate
for the petitioner

Sudhir Mittal, J. (Oral)

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that on a complaint made by him against respondent No. 4, the police authorities had summoned both of them. During the course of the proceedings, respondent No. 4 had admitted that he had to pay a sum of Rs. 1,05,000/- to the petitioner. Thereafter, a sum of Rs. 25,000/- has been paid but balance amount of Rs. 80,000/- is still outstanding. Despite representations having been made, the police has failed to take any action.

Notice of motion to respondents No. 1 to 3 only.

Mr. S.P. Singh, AAG Haryana notice on behalf of respondents No. 1 to

3. Let four copies of the petition be supplied to him during the course of the day.

Considering the nature of the order being passed, there is no necessity to issue notice to respondent No. 4.

The petition is disposed of with direction to respondent No. 2 to objectively consider the representation dated 04.09.2018 (Annexure P-2) and to take appropriate action thereupon in accordance with law, in case it is felt necessary, within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

October 25, 2018

reena

[SUDHIR MITTAL]**JUDGE****Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No****Whether Reportable : Yes/No**