

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

118

CRM-M-3039-2020(O&M)

Date of Decision : **September 05, 2022**

BAKSHISH SINGH

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI

Present : Mr. Sahil Gambhir, Advocate
for the petitioner.

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI. J. (Oral)

Mr. Sahil Gambhir, Advocate has stated that he has been recently engaged and has filed his power of attorney which is taken on record.

The present petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for issuance of a directions to the official respondents to take lawful action upon the representation (Annexure P-1) dated 14.3.2019.

The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the private respondents No. 5 and 6 were having land in their names and still they received old age pension and, therefore, has committed a fraud upon the State machinery. He submitted that an representations/complaints were given to the SSP, Ferozepur vide Annexure P-1, District Welfare Officer, Ferozepur Annexure P-2 and Deputy Commissioner, Ferozepur Annexure P-3 but no action has been taken till date. He further submitted that in view of the aforesaid position, criminal action should be taken against the private respondents.

I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner.

The grievance of the petitioner is that the private respondents were holding land in their names and also received old age pension. However, representation has been given to the Deputy Commissioner as well as to the District Welfare Officer, Ferozepur who are the competent authorities in such like cases to deal with the matters as to whether the allegations are true or not and thereafter in case prima facie the allegations are found to be true only then some actions may be taken although in accordance with law. Apart from the same, a perusal of Annexure P-4 would show that it is self declaration form of respondent No.5 that the entire amount has already been returned back.

In view of the aforesaid position, this Court is of the view that it is not a fit case for exercising the jurisdiction under Section 482 Cr.P.C. and the remedy, if any, is at the first instance for pursuing his representation before the Deputy Commissioner or before the District Welfare Officer.

Therefore, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is, hereby, dismissed.

September 05, 2022

ajay-1

(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)
JUDGE

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