

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH
CRM-M-36935-2019
Date of Decision: 03.09.2019

Sunil Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present:- Mr. Rohit Mittal, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Amol Rattan Singh, J. (Oral)

In respect of his grievance against respondent no.4, who learned counsel submits was an employee in the firm run by the petitioner, the petitioner is stated to have made a representation to the SHO, Police Station, City Narnaul. A copy of the undated complaint (if at all it has been made), having been annexed as Annexure P-5 with the petition.

Though the representation is made to the SHO, the petitioner would be at liberty to approach respondent no.2, i.e. the Superintendent of Police, Narnaul, in respect of his grievance, who would hear him, and if any action is warranted at all, necessary action as per law would be taken.

It is made absolutely clear that this Court has expressed no opinion on the merits of the allegations made in the petition.

Disposed of in the above terms.

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

03.09.2019

vcgarg

Whether reasoned/speaking: Yes
Whether reportable: No