

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

CRM-M-5917 of 2019

Date of decision: 22nd August, 2023

Sheetal Bhardwaj

Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. Bikram Chaudhary, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Chetan Sharma, DAG, Haryana.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (Oral):

1. This is a petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. seeking directions to respondents No. 1 to 3 to protect life and liberty of the petitioner and family members. Further prayer is that representation dated 4.9.2018 be considered and appropriate legal action be taken against the police officials.
2. The brief facts are that husband of the petitioner was a shooter and possessed weapon. As per allegations forged licences were re-registered in Gurugram in connivance with the officials who used to issue 'No Objection Certificate'. The husband of the petitioner was arrested by CIA on 24.2.2017. It was alleged that that Sub-Inspector Suresh demanded Rs.5,00,000/- on behalf of ACP. The husband of the petitioner was granted bail by this court vide order dated 24.7.2017. Investigation of the FIR was entrusted to CIA. Husband of the petitioner was also accused in FIR No. 169 dated 27.7.2018, under Sections 171, 419 and 420 IPC, registered at Police Station Bhondsi, District Gurugram and raid was conducted by the officials to apprehend the husband of the petitioner. Representation was moved stating that on 27.7.2018, police party came to the house of the petitioner and misbehaved with the family members and there was non

compliance of the procedure.

3. Learned counsel for the State relies upon the pleadings of the status report and submits that the complaint was considered, departmental enquiry was initiated against Suresh and his one increment was stopped. He further submits that action was challenged by filing a writ petition and the order stopping increment was set aside by this court.

4. In view of the above noted facts and considering that complaint of the petitioner was considered and departmental action was taken against the police official, no further directions are called for.

5. The petition is disposed of.

6. Needless to say that the petitioner would be at liberty to avail remedies in accordance with law for redressal of the surviving grievance, if any.

[AVNEESH JHINGAN]
JUDGE

22nd August, 2023
mk

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|----------|
| 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned | : | Yes / No |
| 2. Whether reportable | : | Yes / No |