

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

211

**CWP-6406-2017
Date of decision: 20.01.2023**

RANJIT SINGH

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present:- Mr. Sanjeev Sharma, Legal Aid Counsel
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vishnav Gandhi, DAG, Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The present petition had been filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India for seeking issuance of writ in the nature of Mandamus for handing over of the investigation of complaint dated 09.06.2016 (Annexure P-4) to the Central Bureau of Investigation or in the alternative to the SIT to be constituted so that justice could be imparted to the petitioner.

2. Written statement on behalf of the respondents had been filed wherein it was pointed out that the petitioner had moved an application to the Incharge of Police Post Lawrence Road, Police Station, Civil Lines, Amritsar which had been received by the concerned police official and an enquiry into the same was conducted after recording the statements of the witnesses/shopkeepers situated near by to the place on the same day i.e.

09.06.2016. On the basis of the statements of the shopkeepers, the allegations leveled in the application by the petitioner were not found to be substantiated.

3. The petitioner, however, insisted upon getting his medical examination conducted which was thereafter undertaken in the Civil Hospital, Amritsar on 11.06.2016. The injuries found on the person of the petitioner were declared by the Doctors to be simple in nature. It was also revealed that the allegations of attempt to kidnap, snatching of cash amount and mobile phone etc. from the petitioner were not substantiated. It was also revealed that the petitioner used to harass Ravneet Kaur, sister of Gulsahil Singh who is doctor by profession and is married in Rajasthan by making calls and sending SMS to her and by sending E-mails to her and also on the Facebook. On the asking of Gurshail Singh, his uncle Harvinder Singh alongwith his friend had gone to the shop of the petitioner to advise him to refrain from doing said things in which a minor altercation had taken place and the petitioner had apologized in writing about this and promised not to repeat the same in future. As no cognizable offence was found to be taken place, a DDR in this regard was recorded and the petitioner was advised to pursue the matter as per law.

4. Legal Aid Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner could not refer to any material to controvert the aforesaid finding recorded by the Investigating Agency. It is also significant to point out that the aforesaid response had been filed by the respondents in the year 2018 and no rejoinder/application controverting of aforesaid finding of fact or the stand adopted by the respondent-State had been filed.

5. In view of the above, no directions are required to be issued in

the instant case. The instant petition is accordingly disposed of with liberty to the petitioner to take recourse to the alternative remedies available to him in accordance with law.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

JANUARY 20, 2023
Vishal Sharma

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