

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

CRWP-10687-2023

Date of decision : 11.12.2023

PARGAT GILL AND ANOTHER

...Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present : Mr. Lakhwinder S. Lakhanpal, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Tarun Aggarwal, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (ORAL)

Status report by way of affidavit of Jatinder Singh, PPS, ACP, Industrial Area-A, Ludhiana has been filed on behalf of respondent-State today in Court, which is taken on record. Copy supplied.

2. Relevant extract of the status report reads as under :

“4. That the respondent No.8 Madhu Maseeh Wife of Sunil Maseeh R/o House No.34064, Street No.04, New Puneet Nagar, Tibba Road, Ludhiana Joined the investigation and she gave her statement as follows :

"I do private job, Shobha Wife of Amarjeet Kumar R/o House No.444, Near Lakha Singh's Dera Haibowal, Ludhiana, who used to visit the house Church of Pushpinder Pastor, and I also used to go there. Hira Lal also used to visit the same Church, hence we got acquainted to him and we used to visit each other's house. He told Amarjeet Kumar that he will send his son abroad (America) and obtained an amount of rupees 5-6 lakh from him. He even lured me and my sister Rajji R/o Jagraon that he would arrange job for our sons, and obtained an amount of Rs.50,000 each from both of us. Thereafter he neither arranged any job for our sons nor did he return our money. Thereafter he stopped picking our telephone calls, and even closed his WhatsApp number. Then gradually we got to know that he had also many other persons in this matter. Thereafter I uploaded

his image on Facebook so as to caution other persons so they do fall prey to his fraudulent tricks. Apart from this I have no enmity with him, after this I never met him neither did, I issue any threats to him"

5. That accordingly, after through enquiry, it has been found that the dispute is of financial nature and in this regard, the amount of Rs.1,60,000 has already been returned by the petitioners to the respondent No.7 Anjali. Moreover, during the investigation the petitioners could not produce any witness, documents or any other source regarding issuance of threat by Amarjeet Kumar etc. or uploading of any photo. Both the parties are residing at different addresses and there is no threat of life and liberty to the complaint from the opposite party. Hence the complaint does not require any action and the same was recommended to be filed. Accordingly, the report made by Assistant Commissioner of Police, Industrial Area, Ludhiana has been approved by the Commissioner of Police, Ludhiana.”
3. In view of above, counsel for the petitioners prays for withdrawal of the present petition with liberty to avail alternate remedies in accordance with law.
4. Dismissed as withdrawn with liberty as prayed for.

December 11, 2023		(Pankaj Jain)
Dpr		Judge
Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No