

CRM-M-749-2019

Date of Decision: 15.03.2023

Inderjit Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Akhil Dadwal, Advocate for
Mr. Krishan Singh Dadwal, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Karunesh Kaushal, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in the present petition is for issuance a direction to respondents No.2 to 4 to order probe into the illegal activities of the police official and grant protection to the petitioner from respondents No.5 to 7, who at the behest of respondents No.8 to 12 are trying to dispossess the petitioner and unnecessary calling him to the Police Station.

This Court vide order dated 11.01.2019 directed the State to file the status and interim order was passed not to involve or arrest the petitioner in any case without issuing notice under Section 160 Cr.P.C. Thereafter, status report by way of affidavit of Mandeep Singh Sidhu, PPS, Senior Superintendent of Police, Patiala was filed.

Learned State counsel has drawn the attention of this Court to the status report and has submitted that the main dispute is family dispute with the sister-in-law (Bhabhi) of the petitioner. He has submitted that various civil cases are also pending between the parties. He has submitted that the allegations levelled against the police officials by the petitioner were duly enquired into by the SSP (Investigation), Patiala and statement of both the parties were also recorded. After enquiry, the SSP (Investigation), Patiala concluded that the allegations levelled by the petitioner were without any

substance and were found false. The enquiry report dated 18.06.2019 was submitted by the SSP (Investigation), Patiala. It is submitted that as on date the allegations made by the petitioner do not survive any more. He submits that the civil suits, which are pending between the parties, would be decided by the Court concerned and the Police has no involvement in the same. He also submits that the Investigating Agency would not commit any violation of the established procedure in case the petitioner is required for any investigation/enquiry.

After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is apparent that the respondent-authorities have enquired into the allegations made by the petitioner and found no truth in the same. However, this Court vide order dated 11.01.2019 had directed the State not to arrest the petitioner without issuing notice under Section 160 Cr.P.C. This Court do not find any further direction required to be issued in this case, however, the State would abide by the established procedure under Code of Criminal Procedure in case the petitioner is required for any further investigation, as already directed by this Court. The petitioner would be at liberty to pursue his remedy in accordance with law, if so required.

Disposed of accordingly.

15.03.2023
sharmila

Whether Speaking/Reasoned
Whether Reportable

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

: Yes/No
: Yes/No