

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

107)

CRM-M-34890 of 2020

Date of Decision: 24.11.2020

Manjit Kaur and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present:- Mr. Deepak Agnihotri, Advocate, for the petitioners.
Mr. Dhruv Dayal, Sr. DAG, Punjab.
Mr. Maninder Arora, Advocate, for the complainant.

Amol Rattan Singh, J. (Oral)

All the cases listed today have been taken up for hearing by way of video conferencing because of the situation existing due to the Covid-19 pandemic.

By this petition, filed under the provisions of Section 482 of the Cr.P.C., the petitioners seek issuance of a direction to respondent nos.1 to 3, i.e. the State of Punjab and its officers, to decide their representation dated 27.09.2020 in respect of Complaint no.C/No.1803/SR filed by respondent no.4 in the Economic Offence Wing, Kapurthala, with the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioners being that the matter is wholly a civil dispute and therefore no criminal complaint is even maintainable.

Even prior to any notice of motion having been issued, or even a direction having been issued by this court, Mr. Maninder Arora, Advocate, appears for the complainant and submits that as a matter of fact petitioner no.1 in fact agreed to sell certain property to the said respondent despite there being an interim order by a civil court staying alienation of the property, in which civil suit the first petitioner is very much a party as a

defendant.

He further submits that in fact a compromise was reached between the parties which was not honoured by the petitioner.

Mr. Agnihotri however expresses ignorance at this stage with regard to any compromise reached between the parties.

Be that as it may, this only being a petition seeking a direction to the authorities to decide the representation of the petitioners, it is disposed of with a direction to the SSP, Kapurthala (respondent no.4) to go into the matter and after hearing both the parties, take a decision as per law on the issue, within a period of three weeks from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

It is made absolutely clear that this court has only noticed the contentions raised before it by counsel on both sides and has made no observation whatsoever on the merits of those contentions, or the matter itself.

24.11.2020
vcgarg

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking: Yes
Whether reportable: No