

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

**CRM-M No. 16852 of 2020
Date of decision: 29.09.2020.**

Rajinder Kumar @ Raju

..... Petitioner.

Versus

State of Punjab and others

..... Respondents.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Sandeep Arora, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Dhruv Dayal, Senior DAG, Punjab, for the respondents.

ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

Heard through video conferencing.

The petitioner is seeking directions to respondents No. 4 and 5 not to harass him.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is a Press Photographer and is also in the business of sale and purchase of properties. He also contends that the petitioner is threatened by respondent No. 4, who is a police officer.

In the reply, it is stated that the petitioner is involved in the illegal trade of illicit liquor and five cases have been registered against him under Section 61 of the Punjab Excise Act, 1914 ('Excise Act' - for short). The details of the criminal cases have been set out in the reply. In two of these cases, the petitioner has been acquitted by the trial Court while three cases are pending wherein 'challan' has been filed in two of them and the third case bearing FIR No. 66 dated 23.04.2020 registered at Police Station

Basti Bawa Khel, District Jalandhar, is under investigation and the petitioner was released on bail in this case. Apart from this, two 'kalenderas' under Section 110/150 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, have been presented against the petitioner by the local police before the Deputy Commissioner of Police-cum-Executive Magistrate, Jalandhar. In both 'kalenderas', the petitioner has been bound for good behaviour in future on submission of surety bond amounting to ₹1 lakh for a period of one year by the Deputy Commissioner of Police-cum-Executive Magistrate, Jalandhar, vide order dated 16.04.2018 and 01.11.2019, respectively.

Learned State counsel contends that another case FIR No. 230 dated 04.08.2020, under Section 61 of the Excise Act and Sections 420, 465, 467 and 471 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Basti Bawa Khel, District Jalandhar, has also been registered against the petitioner.

Heard.

It is thus apparent that several cases have been registered against the petitioner pertaining to the Excise Act. The allegations which have been levelled against respondent No. 4 are bald and unsubstantiated. In such circumstances, I am not inclined to issue directions, as prayed for, to the respondents.

Consequently, the petition stands dismissed.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

29.09.2020
Ramesh

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No