

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

102

**CRWP-10771-2022 (O&M)
Decided on : 15.03.2023**

Abhishek Sharma

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and others

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Anmol Jeevan Singh Gill, Advocate for
Mr. Gursewak Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. J.S. Arora, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

On 16.11.2022 following order was passed by this Court:

“Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that on 25.10.2022, around 3.50 pm, DSP-STF alongwith his team came to the hotel of petitioner and to create a terror in his mind, petitioner was illegally picked up (detained) by them. In this regard, CCTV Footage and photographs of the alleged incident are available with the petitioner.

Though, it appears to be the dispute a money transaction between the petitioner on one hand and respondents No. 6 and 7 other side, yet only to seek clarification of the fact mentioned in paragraph No. 2 (iii) of the petition, this Court would like to see the status report of the official respondents, in regard to the issue of kidnapping and recording in CCTV footage of the hotel of the petitioner.

Petitioner will supply all such evidence or copy of such evidence to the respondent No.4, within one week from today.

Adjourned to 06.12.2022.

Mr. AS Sandhu, AAG, Punjab, is directed to get the fact examined especially the allegations mentioned in paragraph No. 2(iii) and then to submit status report before this Court on or before the next date of hearing. ”

Thereafter, respondents No. 1 and 2 filed short reply dated 07.01.2023 by way of an affidavit of Sikander Singh, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Special Task Force, Border Range, District Amritsar.

Mr. Anmol Singh Sandhu, AAG, Punjab, refers paragraphs No.5

of the short reply, which is reproduced here-in below:-

“5. That during the course of investigation, the undersigned along with the other police officials reached at the hotel of the petitioner amely Abhishek Sharma and the petitioner was apprised about the facts pertaining of the present case and during the course of his interrogation, he voluntarily stated before the undersigned to the effect that he is running the business of hotel and many customers are coming to his hotel and he is willing to come present at the office of the undersigned at police station STF, Amritsar and he will co-operate with the investigation and keeping in view the reputation and business of the petitioner, the petitioner was taken to police station STF, Amritsar and during the course of his interrogation, he was questioned about the facts of the present case and the mobile phone of the petitioner was also checked and after minutely investigating from the petitioner, no incriminating evidence came on record against the petitioner, as such, he was released from police custody as he was not required in the present case.”

In view of the stand taken by respondents No. 1 and 2 and as reproduced here-in above, learned counsel for the petitioner does not press the present petition.

Accordingly, present petition stands **disposed of**, being not pressed.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

15.03.2023

Riya

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