

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-5219-2019 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 27.02.2019

Sanjeev Kumar Jindal @ Tony

--Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

--Respondents

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

Present:- Mr. Siddharth Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.J (Oral)

As per pleadings on record, the sole petitioner and respondent no.7 Santosh Kumari are cousins. There is a dispute with regard to setting up of a Will of the grandparents of both petitioner as also respondent no.7. Counsel submits that even a civil suit has been instituted by respondent no.7 seeking a declaration against the Will in question and in which petitioner had been arrayed as a party/defendant no.1.

The short grievance raised in the petition is that pertaining to the same very civil dispute repeated complaints are being lodged by respondent no.7 with the police authorities and inspite of two inquiries having been concluded in favour of the petitioner, he is continuously being harassed.

Counsel argues that inspite of two separate inquiries having been conducted by the S.H.O., Police Station, Nehianwala, District Bathinda/respondent no.4 and the S.H.O., Police Station, Canal Colony, Thandi Sadak, District Bathinda/respondent no.5 and the petitioner having been exonerated, he is still being summoned by respondent no.5 in the matter. It is urged that repeated inquiries in a matter are not permissible and such course of action runs contrary to the standing orders issued by the

D.G.P., Punjab as also against the dictum laid down by this Court in the judgement dated 12.1.2009 rendered in ***CRM-M-18244-2008 (Jaswinder Singh Vs. State of Punjab and others)*** (Annexure P-8).

In view of the limited grievance voiced in the petition and without even ascertaining the correctness of the averments made in the petition, I deem it appropriate to dispose of the petition in terms of granting liberty to the petitioner to approach respondent no.2 i.e. the S.S.P., Bathinda in terms of filing a representation. In the eventuality of the petitioner doing so, respondent no.2 would be obligated to examine the matter and to thereafter take necessary steps as he may deem fit and as mandated in accordance with law.

Disposed of.

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

27.02.2019

lucky

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable:	Yes/No