

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

COCP-2052 of 2021(O&M)
Date of Decision: December 23, 2021

Tek Ram

...Petitioner

Versus

Krishan Kumar Rao

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARINDER SINGH SIDHU

--

Present: - Mr.D.S.Matya, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms.Mamta Singla Talwar, DAG, Haryana.

HARINDER SINGH SIDHU, J.

This is a contempt petition alleging willful and intentional disobedience of the order dated 23.06.2021 (Annexure P-1) passed by this Court in CRWP-5685-2021 titled "Tek Ram vs. State of Haryana and others".

The relevant part of order dated 23.06.2021 reads:

"In view of the aforesaid prayer made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to Commissioner of Police, Gurugram to decide the representation dated 31.05.2021 (Annexure P-6) moved by the petitioner, within one month, in accordance with law, after receipt of the copy of this order."

The petitioner alleged that no decision on his representation has been taken, as directed.

Reply has been filed by way of affidavit of K.K.Rao, IPS, Commissioner of Police, Gurugram, stating that the representation dated 31.05.2021 was sent to the Deputy Commissioner of Police, East, Gurugram to enquire and take necessary action as warranted by law. As per the report of the

DCP, during the course of enquiry, it has come out that the petitioner and alleged accused i.e. his son Sant Ram were involved in property dispute and in this regard civil cases are pending between the parties. The complainant/petitioner and the alleged accused as also some villagers were joined in the enquiry and from their statements, it has come forth that no cognizable offence is made out and there is no threat of life and liberty to the petitioner at the hands of his son Sant Ram and others. The petitioner failed to produce any evidence or witness in support of his allegations. The petitioner used to move applications including the representations dated 31.05.2021 and 25.06.2021 just to create pressure on the other party. There being no truth found in the allegations, the applications have been filed by passing a speaking order dated 14.12.2021 (Annexure R-1).

The reply also states that both the parties used to file complaints against each other and a *kalandra* under Section 107/151 CrPC dated 02.03.2021 had also been filed against them as a preventive action.

In the above circumstances, no further proceedings are required in the present petition.

Rule is discharged.

Petition stands disposed of accordingly.

December 23, 2021

gian

**(HARINDER SINGH SIDHU)
JUDGE**

Whether Speaking / Reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable	Yes / No