

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

248

CRM-M-38333-2020 (O&M)
Date of decision: 17.11.2022

MANDEEP SINGH AND ORS

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : None for the petitioners.

Mr. M.S. Joshi, Additional AG Punjab.

Mr. Ranjit Singh Sidhu, Advocate for respondent No.5.

AMAN CHAUDHARY. J.

Present petition has been filed under Section 482 CrPC read with Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of directions to official respondent Nos.3 and 4 not to harass the petitioners calling them at Police Station Dhuri and Police Post Ranike time and again without any cogent reasons, at the instance of respondent Nos.5 to 10.

Notice of motion in this case was issued on 15.01.2021, pursuant thereto status report by way of affidavit of Yogesh Sharma, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub-Division, Dhuri, District Sangrur has been filed. Learned State counsel makes a reference to para 5 of the same, which reads thus:-

“5. That in view of the facts mentioned above, neither the petitioners were called in the Police Station Dhuri or Police Post Ranike time and again nor any question of harassing them at the hands of anyone does not arise at all. The averments made by the petitioners are based on a concocted story and there is not even an iota of truth in it. Rather, in fact, Mandeep Singh, husband of the applicant (now petitioner No.1) was issued notice u/s 160 Cr.P.C. by the said Inquiry

Officer to join the inquiry, however, he did not turn up, rather his father Bhagwant Singh (petitioner No.2) had come present in Police Post Ranike on 07.11.2020 and took time to come again on 10.11.2020. On 10.11.2020 Bhagwant Singh had come present and took another time for 17.11.2020, however, instead of 17.11.2020, Bhagwant Singh had come present on 22.11.2020 and his statement was recorded. Except to the said facts the local Police has not done any illegal act, rather the local Police has acted strictly in accordance with law in conducting inquiry into the said application submitted by Gurpreet Kaur (respondent No.5) wife of Mandeep Singh (petitioner No.1) and consigning the same finding no action required to be taken being a family dispute between husband and wife. Hence, the present petition being devoid of any merits deserves to be dismissed.”

In view of the aforesaid, learned State counsel submits that the present petition has been rendered infructuous and may be disposed of as such.

In view of the above, no further orders are required to be passed in the present case.

Petition is disposed of as having been rendered infructuous.

However, liberty is granted to the petitioner to avail of alternate remedy, available to him, in accordance with law.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

November 17, 2022

S.Sharma(syr)

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