

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

103

**CRM-M-34950-2020
Decided on : 02.11.2020**

Mandeep Kanwar

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

(Through Video Conferencing)

PRESENT: Mr. B.P.S. Gill, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Ms. Rashmi Attri, AAG, Punjab.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in the instant petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is for directing respondent No.2 to register an FIR against (1) Harpinder Singh S/o late Dalbir Singh, r/o H.No. 44, Gali Murabbe Wali, Krishna Nagar, Amritsar, (2) Parminder Singh s/o Gurbakhsh Singh, r/o Gali No.5, Krishna Nagar, Amritsar, (3) Surinder w/o Harpinder Singh, r/o H.No.44, Gali Murabbe Wali, Krishna Nagar, Amritsar, (4) Karnail Singh, Hasuri Ragi of Golden Temple, employee of SGPC, r/o Amritsar, (5) Pritpal Singh Grover, r/o Farmers Society Flats, Sector 13, Rohini, Delhi (NCR) and (6) Sarvjeet Singh Virk, Member Delhi Sikh Gurdwara Management Committee, for commission of offences under Sections 313, 341, 376, 379, 420, 500, 506 read with 120-B of IPC and 64/65 of the IT Act, as per the details mentioned in the instant petition.

2. The grievance of the petitioner is that despite knocking on the doors of the authorities concerned for registration of an FIR against the persons, who allegedly committed offences under Sections 313, 341, 376, 379, 420, 500, 506 read with 120-B of IPC and 64/65 of the IT Act, against her, when she visited India in the year 2011 to perform the last rites of her father,

no action had been taken and the accused persons had been roaming around freely.

3. Heard and perused the paper book.

4. It is a matter of record and not disputed either that pursuant to the complaint made by the petitioner, a Special Investigation Team (SIT) was constituted on the directions of this Court in the year 2015 to look into her allegations. However, it seems that the SIT did not find any substance in the allegations levelled by the petitioner in her complaints.

5. In case the petitioner was aggrieved by the manner in which the SIT investigated the matter, she should not have been sleeping in this regard. Strangely, she remained silent for the past five years after the SIT concluded its investigation.

6. The sequence of events as detailed in the petition beginning from the date of alleged occurrence i.e. 01st September, 2011, does not *prima facie* make out any ground for this Court to exercise its inherent jurisdiction under Section 482 Cr.P.C. and issue any directions as prayed for.

7. In the facts and circumstances of the case, the instant petition stands dismissed. The petitioner is, however, at liberty to avail of any alternate remedy as may be available to her, in accordance with law.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

November 02, 2020

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*
Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*