

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRWP-1343-2021 (O&M)
Date of decision: 12.02.2021

Surinderjit Singh

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present: Mr. Deepanshu Mehta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Joginder Pal Ratra, DAG, Punjab.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (ORAL)

This 2nd criminal writ petition has been filed with a prayer to issue directions to the official respondents to protect the life and liberty of the petitioner in the light of representation (Annexure P-1); earlier criminal writ petition i.e. CRWP-778-2021 was disposed of on 28.01.2021, by passing the following order: -

“Prayer in this petition is for issuance of directions to respondents No.2 & 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioner and decide the representation (Annexure P-1).

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that respondent

No.5 Ramandeep Kaur was married to Gurveer Singh, who is son of niece of the petitioner. Thereafter, Gurveer Singh travelled abroad and on account of some matrimonial, respondent No.5 Ramandeep Kaur had filed a complaint with the Women Cell and now the police is harassing the petitioner on the pretext that he, being a distant relative of Gurveer Singh, is also to be involved in the complaint moved by respondent No.5. It is further submitted that the petitioner has already given two representations to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Jagraon and the Senior Superintendent of Police, Moga.

Notice of motion.

On asking of the Court, Mr. Joginder Pal Ratra, DAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and on instructions from ASI Jaswinder Singh, submits that the petitioner is not required in any complaint or FIR registered by respondent No.5 in any manner.

In view of the above, this petition is rendered as infructuous.”

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that after passing of the aforesaid order, again the petitioner was summoned by the office of Superintendent of Police, Jagraon and was extended threats.

In response, learned State counsel has submitted that in fact, the petitioner has also given a complaint to the Senior Superintendent of Police,

which was marked to the Superintendent of Police, Crime against Women, Gurmeet Kaur and for verification of the same, the petitioner was called, as it was his own complaint. Learned State counsel, on instructions from SP, Crime against Women, Gurmeet Kaur, stated at bar that the petitioner was not summoned on 05.02.2021 on a complaint given by respondent No.5, as it is already stated before this Court at the time of passing of the order dated 28.01.2021 that nothing has come against the petitioner in a complaint filed by respondent No.5.

After hearing learned counsel for the parties, it seems that the petitioner himself is habitual of giving complaints to various authorities and in case any complaint is given, the authority is bound to call the petitioner to verify contents of the same and in that process, he was called in the office of SP on 05.02.2021.

Finding no illegality, present petition is dismissed.

[ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN]
JUDGE

12.02.2021
vishnu

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether Reportable : Yes/No