

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

CRM-M-14462-2024

Decided On: 20.03.2024

SOM NATH MEHTA

.....PETITIONER(s)

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....RESPONDENT(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Saurabh Bajaj, Advocate
for the petitioner.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.(Oral)

1. The prayer in the instant petition is for issuance of appropriate direction to the official respondents to protect the life and liberty of the petitioner at the hands of the private respondents, with a further prayer to direct the official respondents to look into the representation dated 04.11.2023 (Annexure P-10) made by the petitioner and to take legal action against the private respondents.
2. Learned counsel submits that vide representation (Annexure P-10), respondent No.2 – Senior Superintendent of Police, District Mansa had been duly intimated about the fraud committed upon the petitioner at the hands of private respondents. However, the authorities concerned had failed to initiate any action against the offenders. Learned counsel contends that despite respondent No.2 having been apprised about the commission of cognizable offence by the accused persons, the official respondents had failed to proceed against them under the provisions of law. It has been submitted that the official respondents were under a legal obligation to pass an appropriate order on his representation.

3. Notice of motion to the official respondents.
4. On the asking of the Court, Mr. Amit Rana, Sr. DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the said respondents.
5. In the wake of the limited prayer of the petitioner, the petition is disposed of and respondent No.2 i.e. Senior Superintendent of Police, District Mansa is directed to look into his grievance and take appropriate steps, if any required, under the provisions of law. However, if respondent No.2 does not find the commission of any cognizable offence as alleged or any substance in the allegations levelled in the representation dated 04.11.2023 (Annexure P-10) then the petitioner shall be duly informed as per the parameters laid down by the Supreme Court in *Lalita Kumari v. Government of Uttar Pradesh & Ors.* 2013 (4) RCR (Criminal) 979.

20.03.2024

Aman Dua

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No