



CRM-M-37841-2024 (O&M)

1

115 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-37841-2024 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 05.09.2024

JAGPREET KAUR

.....PETITIONER

Vs.

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE HARPREET KAUR JEEWAN


Present:- Ms. Shweta Bawa, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Ms. Himani Arora, A.A.G., Punjab.

HARPREET KAUR JEEWAN J.

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 528 of the 'Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023' is for issuance of directions to the respondents, especially respondents No. 3 and 4, i.e. the Senior Superintendent of Police, Patiala, and the Station House Officer, Police Station, Kotwali, District Patiala to take immediate and appropriate action on the complaint dated 21.03.2024 (Annexure P-1), submitted by the petitioner against the nominated person therein.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that the petitioner gave a detailed representation, dated 21.03.2024 (Annexure P-1), to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Patiala (respondent No. 3), however, no action has been taken thereupon thereby violating the directions issued by Hon'ble the Supreme Court in Lalita Kumari vs. State of U.P. and others 2023 (9) SCC 695.

3. A status report, dated 30.08.2024, by way of an affidavit of sh. Vaibhav Chaudhary, IPS, Assistant Superintendent of Police, Posted at City-1, Patiala, along with R-1/T to R-6/T has been filed in Court today by



learned State counsel. The same is taken on record. The conclusion part of the said report reads as under:-

XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX

“6. That, in reply to Para No. 6, it is submitted that in this case inquiry has been conducted as per directions imparted in Lalita Kumari’s case (supra), but nothing incriminating came on the file, as such no action was recommended. Rest of the para is denied word by word. No part of the same is correct.” _

XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is aggrieved with the non-action on the part of the police on the representation dated 21.03.2024 (Annexure P-1).

5. I have considered the aforesaid submissions.

6. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, especially in view of the fact that the petitioner is aggrieved with the non-action on the part of the police, the present petition is disposed of with liberty to the petitioner to avail alternate remedy, in terms of the judgments of the Hon’ble the Apex Court Court passed in Sakiri Vasu vs. State of U.P. and others 2008 (2) SCC 409 and M.Subramaniam and another vs. S. Janki and another 2020 (2) RCR (Criminal) 788.

7. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

September 05, 2024
nitin

(HARPREET KAUR JEEWAN)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking
Whether reportable

Yes
No

Nitin
2024.09.12 13:22
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document