

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

CRM-M-28887 of 2020

DATE OF DECISION : 21.09.2020

Telu Ram

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

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

Mr. Luvinder Sofat, AAG, Punjab.

(Presence has been marked through video conference)

ARUN MONGA, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner has approached this Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C for issuance of directions to the official respondents to arrest respondents No.5 and 6 in FIR No. 155 dated 09.08.2019 under Sections 420/120-B IPC registered at Police Station Sangat, District Bathinda. Further prayer has been made to protect the life and liberty of the petitioner at the hands of respondents No.5 and 6.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is proprietor of firm namely M/s Sohan Lal Telu Ram, Grain Market, Sangat, in District Bathinda. Respondents No.5 and 6 are commission agents having a cotton mill at Bareta Mandi, Bathinda. They purchased cotton crop from the petitioner. A sum of Rs.15,11,295/- is still pending against respondents No.5 and 6 and they are not making the said payment despite repeated requests. In this regard, petitioner made a complaint to police. After due inquiry, an FIR was registered against private respondents No.5 and 6. Bail

petitions of both respondents No.5 and 6 were dismissed by a Court in Bathinda.

3. Learned counsel further submits that after dismissal of the afore said bail petitions, petitioner moved representations dated 21.11.2019 and 24.11.2019, Annexures P-4 and P-5, respectively, seeking arrest of respondents No.5 and 6. Further request has been made to protect the life and liberty of petitioner and his family members but no action has been taken till date.

4. Mr. Luvinder Sofat, AAG, Punjab, who has joined proceedings on service of advance copy of the petition, appears and opposes issuance of notice in the present petition and submits that FIR has already been registered against respondents No.5 and 6.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the petitioner, as also learned State counsel, no grounds for interference are made out.

6. Dismissed.

7. However, it would not be out of place to observe that the official respondent No.4 i.e SHO, Police Station Sangat, District Bathinda, is expected to proceed with further investigation in the aforesaid FIR and if required, after assessing threat perception of the petitioner, take steps to protect the life and liberty of the petitioner, in accordance with law.

SEPTEMBER 21, 2020
Shalini

(ARUN MONGA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned :
Whether reportable :

Yes/No
Yes/No