



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

115

CRM-40563-2024 in/and
CRM-M-50483-2024
Date of decision: 14.10.2024

Sukhjinder Singh @ Jaggi

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. R.K. Arya, Advocate with
Mr. Geeteshwar Saini, Advocate for the petitioner.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)**CRM-40563-2024**

Allowed as prayed for.

CRM-M-50483-2024

1. The petitioner is seeking issuance of directions to the official respondents to look into the matter and take appropriate legal action against the private respondents in pursuance of his representation dated 01.09.2024 (Annexure P-3) as the private respondents have given beatings and caused injuries to him and his brother.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that it is a case of version and cross version, however, an FIR had been registered against the petitioner by the police. It has been further submitted that in the occurrence in question the petitioner's side also sustained injuries at the hands of the opposite party, however, for reasons best known, the official respondents had failed to record the version of the petitioner



CRM-40563-2024 in/and
CRM-M-50483-2024

-2-

against the opposite party. Learned counsel has drawn the attention of this Court to Annexure P-3 which is a complaint/representation given against the private respondents, however, in vain. After arguing for some time, learned counsel submits that the petitioner would be satisfied if appropriate directions are issued to the official respondents, to look into representation dated 01.09.2024 (Annexure P-3), decide the same in the light of *Lalita Kumari v. Government of Uttar Pradesh & Ors. : 2013 (4) RCR (Criminal) 979*, and take appropriate steps.

3. Notice of motion to official respondents only.

4. On asking of the Court, Mr. Navdeep Singh, DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.

5. In the wake of the limited prayer of the petitioner, the instant petition is disposed of and respondent No.2 i.e. Senior Superintendent of Police, District Gurdaspur, is directed to look into the representation of the petitioner, decide the same at the earliest and take appropriate steps, if any required, under the provisions of law. However, if respondent No.2 does not find any substance in the allegations levelled in the representation (Annexure P-3), 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*.

14.10.2024

Vinay

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

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