

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-12852-2024
DECIDED ON: 13.03.2024

HARDEV SINGH

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Ajay Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Nirmaljeet Singh Sidhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Section 482 Cr.P.C. seeking direction to respondents No.2 and 3 for taking appropriate legal action against respondents No.4 and 5, who are causing physical and mental harassment and giving threats of false implication to the petitioner.

Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that respondents No.4 and 5 are causing physical and mental harassment and giving threats of false implication to the petitioner and a representation to that effect alleged to have been made on 04.07.2022 (Annexure P-2), on which no action has been taken so far.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Rajiv Verma, DAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the official respondents/State and submits on instructions from ASI Surinderpal Singh, that in fact the instant petition is mis-directed and an abuse of process of law in the light of the fact that the

petitioner made a statement before the police on 15.10.2023 stating that talks about compromise are going on between the parties to the *lis* and in case it does not materlize then only he will inform the authorities to take further action, if so required. A categoric stand taken by Mr. Rajiv Verma, learned DAG, Punjab to the effect that since then petitioner never approach the concerned police officers for initiating further action whatsoever.

Today, learned counsel appearing for the petitioners has sought an adjournment stating that the arguing counsel is in personal difficulty though this Court with the assistance of Mr. Ajay Singh, learned Advocate has gone through the pleadings made herein and deems it appropriate to direct the petitioners to make a fresh representation to the authorities, if so, advised.

In the light of the statement made by learned State counsel, it is further directed that in case any such representation is preferred by the petitioner before the Senior Superintendent of Police, Bathinda, he shall consider and decide the same in accordance with law within a period of two weeks thereafter by passing a speaking order, a copy of which shall be furnished to the petitioner within a period of one week from that date.

The present petition is disposed off in the aforesaid terms.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

13.03.2024
Poonam Negi

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>