

2024:PHHC:162005



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

247

CRWP-9053-2024 (O&M)
Date of decision: 04.12.2024

Nashib Singh @ Nasib Singh**...Petitioner**

Versus

State of Haryana and others**...Respondents****CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA**

Present:- Mr. Fariad Singh Virk, Advocate
for the petitioner.


Mr. Arjun Lakhanpal, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance of direction in the nature of mandamus by directing respondents No. 1 and 2 to decide the representation dated 24.08.2024 as filed by the petitioner in accordance with law and to protect the life and liberty of the petitioner and his family members and further to take action against respondent No.4, who is repeatedly extending threats to implicate the petitioner in false and frivolous case.

2. Upon notice, reply by way of affidavit of respondent No. 4-SI Surender Singh, who is present in Court in person, has been filed, which is available on record. It is submitted therein and learned State counsel has argued that initially a complaint dated 04.07.2024 was received through email from the office of Director General of Police, Haryana regarding sale and purchase of stolen vehicles. The same was duly inquired into, whereby the petitioner was called upon to join inquiry but instead of doing so, he moved an application for grant of anticipatory bail before the Court of learned Sessions

2024:PHHC:162005



Judge, Jind, which was dismissed as withdrawn on 09.08.2024. However, even after dismissal of his bail application, the petitioner did not join the inquiry of the aforesaid complaint. Eventually, the said complaint was filed as no substance was found therein. Thereafter, the petitioner had filed aforesaid representation dated 24.08.2024, which has been duly inquired into and finding no substance, the same has also been filed by the then Superintendent of Police, Jind. During inquiry, it was found that the petitioner and respondent No. 5 were having some money dispute and the matter is subjudice before the competent Court. Respondent No. 4, who is present in person, has denied the allegations levelled against him by the petitioner and has submitted that he had called upon the petitioner to join the inquiry in the aforesaid complaint in discharge of his official duties and had never extended any threat to him or his family members or subjected them to any kind of harassment.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner could not dispute the fact that the aforesaid representation of the petitioner has been duly inquired into and it has been filed.

4. In view of the limited scope of the present petition, since the representation of the petitioner stands decided and filed and respondent No. 4 has categorically stated that there is no threat to the life and liberty of the petitioner or his family member, the present petition is disposed of at this stage as no further orders are called for in the matter.

04.12.2024
Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

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