

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRWP-1412-2021

Date of Decision: 11.02.2021

Harjinder Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI

Present : Mr. Charanjit Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Through Video Conferencing

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India with the prayer for directing the respondent Nos. 2 and 3 i.e. police officials for taking action on the representation dated 15.01.2021 (Annexure P-2).

The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner's wife often goes to her parental house without any reason and does not inform anyone and thereafter, returns with her own wish and treats him in an ill mannered way and threatens him by saying that she will not leave him worth anything and for that he has started living in stress. She has also threatened that she will commit suicide and put him into jail. He has further submitted that the petitioner has given a representation to the Superintendent of Police, Fatehabad (Haryana), vide Annexure P-2, but no action has been taken so far.

I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner.

The submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner as well as averments made in the present petition are totally vague and do not disclose any cause of action pertaining to any cognizable offence. Even a perusal of the representation (Annexure P-2) which is stated to have been given to the Superintendent of Police, Fatehabad, is totally vague. Apart from this, there is nothing to show as to whether actually such a representation was given to the Superintendent of Police, Fatehabad or not. There is neither any postal receipt depicting on the petition or in the representation nor any diary number from which it can be inferred that such a representation was actually moved to the Superintendent of Police, Fatehabad.

In view of the above, this Court is of the opinion that it is not a fit case for interference in exercise of jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. This petition is devoid of any merit.

Consequently, the present petition is hereby dismissed.

(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)
JUDGE

11.02.2021
adhikari

Whether speaking/non-speaking	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No