

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

109

**CRM-M No.36745 of 2020
Date of decision:09.11.2020**

ROSHNI DEVI

.....petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present: Mr.G.S.Sawhney, 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 No.3 to look into the complaint dated 20.7.2020.

Grievance of the petitioner is that respondents No.4 and 5 refused to entertain the complaint of the petitioner. Petitioner contacted respondent No.4 and made an oral complaint by stating that respondent No.5 had refused to take any action in respect of the grievance of the petitioner. Thereafter, the petitioner ventured to file a complaint before respondent No.3 against private respondents No.6 to 8.

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. 3 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.3 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