

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

278

CRM-M-50637-2019 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 13.12.2022

SURINDER CHOPRA

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANR

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. SS Aviraj, Advocate for
 Mr. Vishal Sharma, Advocate
 for the petitioner.

Mr. Pankaj Khullar, AAG Punjab.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J.(Oral)

Through this petition, the petitioner seeks issuance of directions to the respondents to take appropriate action against the accused persons for kidnapping the petitioner and his son.

On 11.12.2019, it was argued by the learned counsel for the petitioner that on 29.08.2019, in the presence of ASI Janak Raj, who came on the spot, the petitioner and his son were locked and taken into illegal custody and made to sign two cheques and an agreement; that the said incident was duly captured on CCTV Camera and that the petitioner and his son were released after they paid Rs.1,00,000/- in cash through their daughter.

Status report by way of an affidavit dated 12.02.2020 of the Assistant Commissioner of Police (Central), Ludhiana, filed on behalf of the respondent-State, in the Registry, is taken on record.

As per the status report, the petitioner moved an application, which was marked to investigating officer and in the inquiry, it was found that ASI Janak Raj, who reached at the spot, authenticate that the allegations of beatings given to the petitioner and his son, were found to be false and that there was a business rivalry between the petitioner and one Naveen Jain, who is a Hosiery Trader. It was also found by ASI JanakRaj that on the spot, a compromise was effected between the parties, which was reduced in writing also; that the said compromise was signed by the petitioner and Rs.1,00,000/- was paid to Naveen Jain as due amount. Accordingly, the application moved by the petitioner was filed.

At this stage, Mr. SS Abhiraj, Advocate appearing on behalf of the petitioner prays for an adjournment, on the ground that the arguing counsel is not available today.

Be that as it may. The present petition pertains to the year 2019. The allegation raised by the petitioner in the complaint was duly looked into and the same were found to be false. The compromise was effected between the petitioner and Naveen Jain, who is a business rival of the petitioner. Rs.1,00,000/- was given by the petitioner to said Naveen Jain, out of the due amount and the petitioner also signed the two cheques.

In view of the above, no ground is made out to issue any direction, at this stage.

Thus, the present petition is dismissed with costs of Rs.10,000/- to be deposited with the Poor Patients' Welfare Fund, Postgraduate Institute of Medical Education and Research (PGIMER), Chandigarh.

13.12.2022

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)

Aman Jain

JUDGE

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