

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

CWP-30713-2019

Date of decision: 9.12.2019

Jatinder Chauhan**.....Petitioner.****vs.****State of Punjab and others****.....Respondents.****CORAM: - HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR**

Present: - Mr. Puneet Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Luvinder Sofat, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

Mr. Kuldeep V. Singh Ahluwalia, Advocate
for respondent No. 6Mr. Parminder Singh Rai, Advocate
for respondent Nos. 7 and 8

.....

Sanjay Kumar, J. (ORAL)

Mr. Kuldeep V. Singh Ahluwalia, learned counsel appeared for respondent No. 6 and Mr. Parminder Singh Rai, learned counsel appeared for respondent Nos. 7 and 8. Both filed their separate vakalatnamas and the same are taken on record.

The grievance of the petitioner was that the police authorities of the State of Punjab were initiating multiple inquiries upon the complaint made against him by respondent No. 6.

Mr. Luvinder Sofat, learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab, having received instructions in the matter from ACP Bimal Kant, ACP Head Quarters, who is present in person, would inform this Court that upon considering the reports submitted, the Deputy Commissioner of Police, acting on behalf of the Commissioner of Police, Jalandhar District,

opined that the complaint made by the sixth respondent against the petitioner involved a dispute of civil nature which did not warrant action on the criminal side and the complaint was accordingly consigned to the record room.

Mr. Kuldeep V.Singh Ahluwalia, learned counsel for the sixth respondent, would state that his client has a grievance with regard to this action on the part of the police. However, this Court cannot go into the grievance, if any, of the sixth respondent in the present case filed by the petitioner. Insofar as the grievance of the petitioner is concerned, the same stands settled in the light of the statement made by Mr. Luvinder Sofat, learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab, upon instructions.

The writ petition is accordingly disposed of as infructuous leaving it open to the sixth respondent to take recourse to appropriate remedies available to him in law, if he has any grievance.

The prayer of the petitioner for damages, directed against respondents No. 4 to 6 and 8 is left unaddressed and the petitioner is granted liberty to pursue his remedies in relation to this claim before the appropriate forum, if he so chooses, in accordance with law.

(SANJAY KUMAR)
JUDGE

9.12.2019

preeti

whether speaking/non speaking

yes/no

whether reportable/non reportable

yes/no