



269

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

**CRM-M No.44429 of 2024
Date of Decision: 15.10.2024**

Harpal Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Ajay Chauhan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. J. S. Arora, DAG, Punjab.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J.

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. praying for issuance of directions to the official respondents to take appropriate action against the private respondents for giving beatings to the petitioner and his companion and for accepting bribe of Rs.50,000/- in lieu of installing the transformer as per representation Nil (Annexure P-1).

2. It has been submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner along with other residents of the colony approached the SDO and JE i.e. respondents No.5 and 6 for replacing the transformer of 16 KVA to 50 KVA of three phase. However in lieu of that, respondents No.5 & 6 demanded an amount of Rs.50,000/- from the residents and the



petitioner which they paid in cash. He has submitted that thereafter respondents No.5 & 6 replaced the transformer with new transformer of 25 KVA of single phase and they assured them that they will install the new transformer of 100 KVA three phase after paddy season. He has further submitted that when respondents No.5 & 6 failed to install the transformer, the petitioner and other residents approached respondent No.4 with their complaint dated 03.10.2021. He has submitted that when the petitioner and other residents reached on the main gate of G.S. alias Sardar Resorts, Malerkotla road, Rania, Ludhiana to give their complaint to respondent No.4, then respondents No.5 & 6 along with other 20-25 gunda elements attacked them. He has submitted that the representation was given by the petitioner for taking the legal action against respondents No.5 & 6, however no action has been taken against them.

3. Learned counsel for the State has opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the reply dated 26.09.2024 filed by way of an affidavit of Harjinder Singh (PPS), Assistant Commissioner of Police, Ludhiana (South) on behalf of respondents No.1 & 3. He has submitted that the petitioner had given a written complaint to the Commissioner of Police, Ludhiana which was assigned vide PGD No.320403 dated 18.03.2024. He has submitted that the preliminary inquiry in the aforesaid complaint was conducted by the ACP, Ludhiana (South). It was ascertained during the preliminary inquiry that “Bijli Panchayat” had indeed been held on 03.10.2021 at G.S. Resort, Rania organized by the Punjab State Power



Corporation Limited (PSPCL), where local consumers and other respected members of the community were present. However during the inquiry, no credible evidence could be established to corroborate the petitioner's allegations of physical assault, use of abusive language or threats to him by respondents No.5 & 6. No MLR or any other supporting document was produced to substantiate the allegations. He has submitted that on the basis of finding of preliminary inquiry, the complaint was recommended for closure vide detailed report dated 25.05.2024. The DCP, Ludhiana (Rural), had granted the approval to the same on 27.05.2024. He has submitted that subsequent complaints were also filed on the same set of allegations regarding which the preliminary inquiry was conducted and the allegations were not substantiated. Thus, he has submitted that no ground for issuing the direction as prayed for is made out and the present petition being devoid of any merit deserves to be dismissed.

4. Heard.

5. On hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the complaint filed by the petitioner was assigned vide PGD No.320403 dated 18.03.2024 and the preliminary inquiry was conducted in the same by the ACP, Ludhiana (South). On conclusion of the same, the allegations levelled in the complaint were not substantiated and thus the same was closed/filed after the approval was accorded by the DCP, Ludhiana (Rural) on 27.05.2024.



6. Hence, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is hereby disposed of however with liberty to the petitioner avail alternative remedies as available to him in accordance with law.

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

15.10.2024
rittu

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No