

235+108

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-41243-2020 (O&M)

Date of decision-19.04.2021

Gurpreet Singh

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

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

Ms. Bhavna Gupta, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Hardip Singh, Advocate for respondent Nos.5 to 8.

MANOJ BAJAJ, J. (Oral)

The petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C has been filed for calling status report of DDR No.44 dated 07.07.2019 registered in FIR No.76 dated 07.07.2019 under Sections 307, 323, 452, 506 and 34 Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Section 307 IPC deleted later on) at Police Station Banur, District SAS Nagar.

Learned State counsel has referred to the reply filed by way of affidavit of Gurvinder Singh, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Circle Rajpura, District Patiala on behalf of respondent No.1 to 3, to contend that after investigation in the cross version set up by the petitioner, a cancellation report was submitted and said averment in the reply reads as under:-

“That during the course of investigation, ASI Gurnam Singh, thoroughly investigated the matter and found that the allegations levelled by Parminder Singh in his complaint and statement, on the basis of which DDR No.44 dated 07.07.2019 was recorded in Police Station Banur, is found to be false and during the course of investigation it was revealed that accused persons namely, Paramjit Singh, Harduman Singh, Parminder Singh and Gurpreet Singh etc are aggressor and forcibly entered the house of Gurwinder Singh and caused injuries to Gurvinder Singh and Mohinder Kaur and in counter blast to the present FIR, they have moved the present complaint and there is no truth in it, moreover the injury as alleged is also not found to be true, hence vide case diary no.24 dated 10.02.2020, ASI Gurnam Singh found that report no.44 dated 07.07.2019 is found to be false. Then, the Station House Officer Police Station Banur, also investigated the matter on the complaint moved by Parminder Singh and he also vide his case diary no.24-A dated 10.02.2020 and the complaint lodged in DDR No.44 dated 07.07.2019 was found to be false.”

At this stage, learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent Nos.5 to 8 has stated that the petitioner has already adopted a remedy by filing a complaint under Section 200 IPC and the same is pending.

This fact is not disputed by learned counsel for the

petitioner that complaint is pending.

Learned counsel for the private respondents has further pointed that filing of the complaint has not been disclosed by the petitioner in the petition.

At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner does not press this petition and prays for withdrawal.

The prayer is accepted.

The petition is ordered to be dismissed as withdrawn.

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

19.04.2021
vanita

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No