

COCP-1049-2022

Date of Decision :02.06.2022

Harjit Kaur

...Petitioner

Versus

Mandeep Singh Sidhu

....Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice B.S. WaliaPresent : Mr. Vipul Goel, Advocate for
Mr. Deepak Goyal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Aditya Sharda, AAG, Punjab.

B.S. Walia, J. (Oral)

[1] Prayer in the petition is for initiating proceedings against the respondent for intentional and willful defiance of order, Annexure P/2 dated 15.12.2020 in CRWP No.10429 of 2020 in case titled as Harjit Kaur vs. State of Punjab and Ors.

[2] A perusal of order, Annexure P/2 reveals that CRWP No.10429 of 2020 was disposed of by directing the respondent to look into and decide representation dated 10.12.2020 filed by the petitioner in accordance with law expeditiously and take such necessary steps as may be warranted under law.

[3] Reply along with report, Annexure R-1/T dated 24.06.2022 of the respondent has been filed in Court today. Learned AAG states that as per para No.9 of the reply it has been mentioned that on the basis of investigation carried out, the petitioner and her accomplices were found to have committed offences under Sections 384, 389, 420, 506 and 120-B

for the aforesaid offences at Police Station City Sunam and on completion of investigation against them, police report under Section 173 Cr.PC. was prepared on 24.06.2021 and presented before the Court of the competent jurisdiction on 25.06.2021 and now the matter is pending consideration before the learned trial Court for framing of charges and the next date in the case is 14.06.2022 and that contents of the representation, Annexure P/1 filed by the petitioner-Harjit Kaur were found to be false. The same is taken on record. Copy thereof supplied to learned counsel for the petitioner, who states that in the circumstances, the petitioner does not press the instant petition and may be permitted to withdraw the same with liberty to challenge report, Annexure R-1/T dated 24.06.2022 by way of appropriate proceedings in accordance with law.

[4] In view of the position noted above as well as statement of learned counsel for the petitioner, the instant petition is disposed of as not calling for any action against the respondent under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 while granting liberty to the petitioner as prayed for.

[5] Rule discharged.

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

02.06.2022

'Amit'

<i>Whether speaking/ reasoned</i>	:	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	:	<i>Yes/No</i>