

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

CWP No. 2969 of 2019
Date of decision:-03.05.2019

Shaminder Singh

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab & others

.....Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA

Present:- Mr. B.S. Aulakh, Advocate for the petitioner.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA, J.(ORAL)

Petitioner seeks a mandamus for directing the official respondents No.1 to 4 under the State of Punjab to transfer an investigation pursuant to a complaint having filed by petitioner to the Central Bureau of Investigation or to any other independent agency.

As per counsel, the petitioner owns an interlock tile factory at Village Barkandi, District Sri Muktsar Sahib and was awarded a contract to supply 03,75,000 tiles to the Government of Punjab. The Office of the BDPO concerned under the Government of India scheme of MANREGA is stated to have transferred an amount of Rs.55,00,000/-approximately in the account of the petitioner for the purpose of carrying out the work order.

Apparently, petitioner is stated to have filed a complaint against respondents No.8 and 9 pointing out various acts of omission and commission.

It is the contention raised by counsel that an enquiry in the matter was marked to the ADC Development Sri Muktsar Sahib and which

is still pending.

Counsel argues that the allegations made by the petitioner against respondents No.8 and 9 are serious in nature and accordingly the matter be entrusted to the CBI for a thorough and independent probe.

Having heard counsel for the petitioner at length and having perused the pleadings on record, this Court is of the considered view that the instant writ petition lacks necessary particulars and as such the prayer raised cannot be entertained.

Even though it is the case projected that an enquiry in the matter has been marked to the ADC Development Sri Muktsar Sahib but there is no document placed on record or referred to during the course of argument which was substantiate the marking of an enquiry to such official.

Counsel on a specific query has also not been able to show as to which authority under the State Government had marked the enquiry on the complaint alleged to have been made by the petitioner.

Under such circumstances, no interference in the matter is called for.

Petition dismissed.

The instant order was dictated in open Court. Confronted with an order of dismissal, counsel at this stage prays for withdrawal of the writ petition. Such request can only be termed as unfortunate and is also rejected.

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

03.05.2019

shweta

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No