

CRM-M-9303-2024

-1-

2024:PHHC:083085



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH
112-2**

CRM-M-9303-2024

Date of Decision: 04.07.2024

Manisha Tandon and others

.... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIDHI GUPTA

Present: - Mr. Parambir Singh, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Kunwarbir Singh, A.A.G., Punjab.

Mr. Ashish Nagar, Advocate
for respondent No.5.

NIDHI GUPTA, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in this petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is for directing the respondents No. 3 and 4 to take action on the representations dated 22.05.2023 (Annexure P-2) and 24.01.2024 (Annexure P-6) filed by the petitioner No.2 and; to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners from the hands of respondents No. 5 to 7.

Status report by way of an affidavit of the Assistant Commissioner of Police, Ludhiana on behalf of respondents No. 1 to 4 dated 03.07.2024 filed in Court today is taken on record. A copy thereof has been supplied to learned counsel opposite.



Learned counsel for the State has referred to para 4 of the said status report wherein it is stated as follows:-

“That apart from the above representation, another representation Annexure P-2 was moved by petitioner No.2 to ASI Harmesh Singh-Incharge-Assault Post-Railway Station-Ahmedgarh and which was wrongly addressed by the petitioner no.2 to the SHO PS City, Ahmedgarh as written on the said representation. In this regard a report was sought from the SHO-P.S. GRP, Ludhiana who reported that the said representation Annexure P-2 was moved by petitioner no.2 with the above noted ASI Harmesh Singh levelling allegations that on 21.05.2023 respondent no.5 has created a seen at the work place of petitioner no.2 situated at railway station-Ahmedgarh. However, during the enquiry by the said ASI, summons were sent to petitioner no.2 to join the enquiry but he did not join the enquiry before the said ASI nor petitioner no.2 produced any proof in support of his allegations. However, Police Commissionerate, Ludhiana has no jurisdiction or concern with the allegations made by petitioner no.2 in his said representation Annexure P-2.”

Learned counsel for the petitioners counters the above said submissions made in the status report and submits that the petitioners had duly presented themselves before the investigating agency and had presented the pendrive of the CCTV footage.

Learned counsel for the State, on instruction from ASI Baldev Singh, reiterates the submissions made in para 4 of the above said status report that the petitioners had never presented themselves before the investigating agency.



In view of the above, no further directions are required to be passed in the present petition and the same is disposed of as such.

04.07.2024

Divyanshi

**(NIDHI GUPTA)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No