

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

112

**CRM-M No.36750 of 2020
Date of decision:09.11.2020**

SUKHDEEP KAUR

.....petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present: Mr.Rajat Garg, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J (oral)

The case has been taken up for hearing through video-conferencing.

This petition has been filed by the petitioner for issuance of appropriate directions to respondent Nos. 1 to 3 for taking lawful action on the representation/ complaint filed by the petitioner before respondent No.3 and thereafter a representation before respondent No.2 (though the representation is not forthcoming, but postal receipt suggests that the representation was made to respondent No.2 on 8.7.2020).

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the requirement of Section 154(1) (3) Cr.P.C. stood complied with and respondent No.2 is under legal obligation to pass an appropriate order on the representation of the petitioner.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of Court, Mr.B.S.Sewak, Addl. A.G.Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the official respondents.

In view of nature of order, which this Court proposes to pass there is no necessity of filing any reply, as no order prejudicial to the interest of either party is being passed.

At this stage, without meaning anything on the merits of the case i.e. whether any cognizable offence has been committed or not, respondent No. 2 is directed to look into the grievance of the petitioner. In case, any cognizable offence is found to have been committed, in such eventuality, respondent No.2 would be at liberty to act in accordance with law. If no such cognizable offence is found to have been committed, then the petitioner would be informed as per the parameters laid down in **Lalita Kumari v. Govt. of U.P. (2014) 2 SCC (1).**

Disposed of.

**(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE**

November 09, 2020
anita

Whether reasoned/speaking

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No