

CRWP-7201-2023

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

(112)

CRWP-7201-2023

Date of Decision:-07.08.2023

Ravish Sharma

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK JAIN

Present: Ms. Shivya Sehgal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. P. S. Grewal, DAG, Punjab.

ALOK JAIN, J. (Oral)

1. In compliance of order dated 03.08.2023, respondent No. 3 is present in the Court and submits that a compliant had been received against the petitioner alleging forgery and misappropriation of documents, although he admits that a copy of that compliant was never supplied to the petitioner but also submits that he is yet to complete the investigation in the said compliant.

2. It is on that accord only that the notice dated 05.06.2023 had been issued to the petitioner to join the investigation in the said compliant.

3. Respondent No. 3 though admits that the copy of compliant has not been handed over and the reasons for the same is that the petitioner never met him and they visited his office and took the date from his Reader and went back, seeking some time to file the reply.

CRWP-7201-2023

4. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, in fact, they had gone with their entire record and the civil dispute is being sought to be given a criminal color.

5. Nonetheless, the petitioner is ready to join the investigation and demonstrate the entire record of the dealings with the complainant.

6. At this stage, Mr. C.S. Bakshi, Advocate has put in appearance and filed his *Vakalatnama* on behalf of respondents No. 4 & 5 in Court today, which is taken on record and submits that there are serious allegations leveled against the petitioner of forging the documents which has caused economic loss to him.

7. Respondent No. 3-Deputy Commissioner of Police, Industrial Area-B, Ludhiana, District Ludhiana, is directed to look into the matter expeditiously and take appropriate action in accordance with law of either dismissing the compliant or lodging the FIR as the case may be and in fact, if it is found that the complaint was only to pressurize the petitioner to squeeze his arm for some money, appropriate action be initiated against respondents No. 4 and 5 in accordance with law.

8. In light of the above, there is no threat perception in the present petition, accordingly the same stands disposed of and no further order deserves to be passed.

(ALOK JAIN)
JUDGE

August 07, 2023

Parul

Whether speaking/reasoned:-	Yes/No
Whether Reportable:-	Yes/No