

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

269

CRM-M-48082-2019 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 22.09.2022

GURLUV SINGH JAURA

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr. Harkanwar Jeet Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. KBS Mann, Advocate for respondents No.4 to 6.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J.(Oral)

There is no representation on behalf of the petitioner today.

Prayer in this petition is for issuance of direction to respondents No.2 and 3 to take legal action against the private respondents, who are alleged to have misbehaved the petitioner.

As per the contents of the present petition, the petitioner is a Doctor by profession, having a good reputation and presently posted as an Orthopedic Surgeon, in Civil Hospital, Malout, District Sri Mukstar Sahib; that respondents No.4 to 7 are the Press Reporters, working with different Newspapers; that respondent No.7-Jatinderjit Singh was admitted to the Hospital for treatment and during his treatment, he had created a scene; that the petitioner was manhandled by respondent No.7 along with respondents No.5 and 6 and was openly threatened to his life and that the entire incident had been captured by the CCTV camera installed in the Hospital. On 09.09.2019, a complaint was moved by the

petitioner to the Police but no action was taken. Thereafter, the petitioner moved a representation dated 16.09.2019 (Annexure P-4) for redressal of his grievances but to no avail.

As per the status report filed by the State, the petitioner and the private respondents were called by the concerned Investigating Officer and secret and open enquiries were conducted. The petitioner was also given an opportunity of hearing. During enquiry, no evidence was found that the petitioner was either blackmailed, misbehaved or threatened by respondents No.4 to 7.

Reply has also been filed by respondents No.4 to 6, wherein it has been stated that the father of the petitioner is running a private hospital in District Bathinda and that the petitioner used to recommend the local patients to get their treatment from the said private hospital.

I have gone through the entire material on record and heard the learned State counsel and learned counsel for respondents No.4 to 6.

In the present case, after thorough enquiry conducted by the Investigating Officer, a conclusion was drawn that the petitioner was neither blackmailed, misbehaved nor threatened by the private respondents.

In view of the above, no further orders are required to be passed by this Court.

Dismissed.

22.09.2022

Aman Jain

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : *Yes/No*
Whether reportable : *Yes/No*