

2023:PHHC:133999

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

110

CRM-M-43897-2023

Date of decision : 11.10.2023

Simranjit Singh**..... Petitioner****versus****State of Haryana and others****..... Respondents****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN**

Present: Ms. Ramandeep Kaur, Advocate for
Mr. Varinder Basa, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gaurav Bansal, DAG, Haryana
for respondents No.1, 4 & 5.

Mr. Tarun Aggarwal, Sr. DAG, Punjab
for respondents No.2 & 3.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition was filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. seeking issuance of directions to respondents No.4 and 5 not to initiate any inquiry against the petitioner claiming that the petitioner is already facing inquiry before the authorities in the State of Punjab and on the same complaint now the enquiry has been initiated by the police authorities in Haryana. However, after perusing status report filed by the State of Punjab as well as State of Haryana, it is evident that the complaints filed at Police Station, Batala and that at Police Station, Kurukshetra are different offences arising out of different occurrences.

2. As per status report filed on behalf of State of Haryana, a complaint was received from respondent No.6 on the basis of which FIR No.69 dated 22.08.2023 was registered under Section 376 of IPC against the present petitioner.

2023:PHHC:133999

3. As per status report filed on behalf of State of Punjab, complaint was received against the present petitioner qua theft alleged to have been committed by the petitioner. Enquiry was conducted on the said complaint. After enquiry, it was found that alleged occurrence had taken place at Dubai which does not fall within the territorial jurisdiction of Police Station, Qadian and complainant also could not produce any evidence to prove the allegations against the petitioner and thus recommendation was made to consign the said complaint.
4. Keeping in view that FIR under Section 376 of IPC has been registered on the complaint made by respondent No.6 against the petitioner, name and details of respondent No.6 be concealed.
5. Registry is directed to do the needful. Respondent No.6 shall now for records be known as A.B.
6. In the background of the aforesaid circumstances, this Court finds no reason to interfere in the present petition as there is no overlapping of investigation as claimed by the petitioner.
7. Resultantly, the present petition is dismissed.

(PANKAJ JAIN)
JUDGE

11.10.2023
Dinesh

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes
Whether Reportable :	No