



262 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-41487-2017
Date of decision: 13.12.2024

JEET SINGHPetitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORSRespondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE **AMARJOT BHATTI**

Present: Mr. K.S. Brar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Senior DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Amit Dhawan, Advocate
for respondent No.4.

Mr. Avtar S. Khinda, Advocate
for respondent No.5.

AMARJOT BHATTI, J.

Petitioner-Jeet Singh has filed the present petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for issuance of direction to respondent No.2 to decide representation dated 16.09.2017 (Annexure P-4) given by the petitioner for taking legal action against respondents No.4 to 9 and the petitioner be not harassed or issue any other appropriate order or direction which the Court may deem fit under the given facts and circumstances of the case.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that on his statement FIR No.158 dated 22.12.2015 under Sections 406, 420 and 120-B, IPC was registered at Police Station Kot Isse khan, District Moga, against Paramjit Kaur and others. Later on, compromise was effected between the parties which is Annexure P-1. In pursuance of this compromise, Rajinder Kumar executed receipt dated 19.09.2016 (Annexure P-2) and as per compromise a sum of Rs.5,50,000/- was



matter in controversy he gave representation to respondent No.2 against respondent No.4 dated 16.09.2017 (Annexure P-4) but no action was taken. Present petition has been filed with a prayer to direct respondent No.2 to consider and decide the representation dated 16.09.2017 (Annexure P-4) and take appropriate action.

3. Status report is filed making reference to FIR No.158 dated 22.12.2015 under Sections 406, 420 and 120-B, IPC registered at Police Station Kot Isse Khan, District Moga, against Kuldeep Singh @ Laddi @ Billu and others. There is no reference to the representation dated 16.09.2017 (Annexure P-4) filed by the petitioner against respondents No.4 to 9 which resulted during the course of alleged compromise dated 16.09.2016 and in pursuance of receipt dated 19.09.2016 (Annexure P-2). As per the allegations of the petitioner, it was Rajinder Kumar who received Rs.5,50,000/-in pursuance of compromise but did not give the same to petitioner in connivance with accused in the aforesaid FIR No.158 dated 22.12.2015, as a result compromise could not materialise. Respondent No.4 has also filed reply and denied the allegations.

4. It is matter of record that today CRM-M-17879-2018 filed by Paramjit Kaur and another for quashing of FIR No.158 dated 22.12.2015 (supra) has been declined.

5. In the light of this, present petition is disposed of with direction to official respondents No.2 and 3 to hold thorough investigation on the representation dated 16.09.2017 (Annexure P-4) within a span of one month and to take appropriate steps as per law.

(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGE

13.12.2024
monika

1. Whether speaking/ reasoned : Yes /No
2. Whether reportable : Yes /No