

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-7644 of 2021

Date of Decision: 24th May, 2022

Baljit Kaur @ Baby

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present : Mr. Gourave Bhayyia, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Sandeep Kumar, DAG, Punjab.
Mr. HPS Ghuman, Advocate for respondents No. 5 to 13.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J.(Oral)

This petition was filed seeking directions to the official respondents to decide the representation dated 16.8.2018 made by the petitioner.

The State has filed reply. Relevant paras of the reply are quoted below:

“10. That it is respectfully submitted that so far as the complaint dated 12.11.2018 submitted by the petitioner is concerned, it is submitted that record from P. C. Branch in the office of SSP, Fatehgarh Sahib was got verified and as per the report received, no such complaint was found to have been ever received from the petitioner. However, the petitioner was found to have submitted two more complaints with similar allegations on dated 30.7.2018 and 14.6.2019 which were also filed after inquiry. No other complaint is pending inquiry with District Police Fatehgarh Sahib.

11. That in view of the facts and circumstances narrated above, it is evident that the petitioner has submitted one after another complaint on the similar allegations, which were

inquired into earlier by DSP (Investigation), Fatehgarh Sahib and allegations were not proved. During inquiry, it was revealed that the petitioner had filed the complaint with a motive to pressurize her in laws for obtaining share in immovable property for which she has a civil remedy. The children of the petitioner are also living with her in laws family and her petition for obtaining their custody is pending consideration before the Ld. Court of competent jurisdiction at Nabha.”

Learned counsel for the State submits that the dispute is with regard to immoveable property of the in-laws of the petitioner. Similar complaints with similar allegations which were filed were looked into and no truth was found.

In view of the reply filed, no further directions are called for.
The petition is disposed of.

Needless to say that the petitioner would be at liberty to avail remedies in accordance with law for redressal of the surviving grievance, if any.

(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE

24th May, 2022
mk

Whether reasoned/speaking	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No