

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CIVIL WRIT PETITION NO. 18042 of 2019

DATE OF DECISION: JULY 08, 2019

Joginder SinghPetitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and othersRespondents

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

Present: Ms.Riffi Bala Birla, Advocate for the petitioner.

<><><>

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA, J.

As per pleadings on record, petitioner is a firm. It has been averred that over a certain period of time, petitioner had sold his produce/crops to respondents No.5 and 6 who happen to be the proprietor and partner of M/s Sri Anand Trading Company Commission Agent, New Grain Market, Fazilka.

Learned counsel submits that during the course of transactions and taking advantage of an illiterate farmer, respondents No.5 and 6 got signed certain blank papers from the petitioner.

The short grievance raised in the petition is that respondents No.5 and 6 taking advantage of the blank papers that were got signed on one pretext or the other from the petitioner, are harassing and threatening the petitioner to pay a certain amount of money, whereas nothing is due. It has further been asserted that respondents No.3 and 4 who have been to be the police officials posted at Police Station, Sadar Fazilka,

District Fazilka are hand in glove with the private respondents and are also threatening and harassing the petitioner. Petitioner has also voiced an apprehension in the instant petition as regards threat to his life and liberty.

Having heard learned counsel for the petitioner at length and without even ascertaining the correctness of the averments made in the petition, I deem it appropriate to dispose of the instant writ petition in terms of granting liberty to the petitioner to approach respondent No.2- Senior Superintendent of Police, Fazilka, District Fazilka as regards his grievance/apprehension. In the eventuality of any such application being filed, respondent No.2 would be obligated to look into the matter and to thereafter take steps as he may deem fit and as warranted in accordance with law.

It is, however, clarified that such directions have been passed without even verifying the submissions advanced by learned counsel and as noticed hereinabove.

Disposed of.

JULY 08, 2019
SRM

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

Note:	<i>Whether speaking/reasoned:</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
	<i>Whether Reportable:</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>