



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

125

CRM-M-8512-2025
Decided on : 12.03.2025

Balbir Singh and another

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Gaurav, Advocate for
Mr. Umesh Aggarwal, Advocate, for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Amandeep Singh, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Ranjodh Singh Sidhu, Advocate
for respondent No.4.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. In the present case, on 14.02.2025, following order was passed:-

"1. Present petition has been filed under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023 seeking issuance of directions to respondents No. 2 and 3 to conduct fair, impartial and proper investigation in representation dated 31.01.2025 (P-5) and to decide the same by passing a speaking order.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that in an incident, which happened on 30.11.2024 at about 11/11:30 am, petitioner has sustained injuries and was also medico legally examined on 30.11.2024 itself. Subsequently, x-ray report was also prepared, wherein it is noticed as under:

"Report:-NCCT Chest shows fracture of left fourth to seventh ribs (4,5,6 and 7 ribs).Underlying lungs appear normal"

3. Counsel further submits that despite submitting of the complaint, no case has been registered against private respondents No. 4 to 6. Counsel also submits that respondent No.4 is Sarpanch of the Village, who is indulged in illegal mining and in that regard complaint has been addressed at the instance of the petitioner. Counsel further submits that respondent No.4 in connivance with local police succeeded in getting criminal case registered against the petitioners, and thereupon both the petitioners have been subjected to FIR No.250 dated 18.12.2024, under Sections 118(2), 61, 351(2) and 351(3) of BNS, Police Station Jhabal, Tarn Taran. Thus, the conduct of the police is not only impartial, rather, despite there being the grievous injuries caused to petitioner No.1, case was also required to be registered against the other side. Counsel submits that there being no hope to the petitioners of conducting fair investigation, they are before this Court through instant petition.

4. Notice of motion for 12.03.2025.

5. On advance notice, Mr. Amandeep Singh Samra, AAG, Punjab, appears on behalf of respondent(s)/State.

6. Learned State counsel would file status report in regard to the submissions made in the present petition and addressed before this Court,



on or before the next date of hearing.

7. To be shown in the urgent list.”

2. Today, learned State counsel has filed the status report dated 11.03.2025 in Court today, which is taken on record, subject to all just exceptions. Office to tag the same at appropriate place.

A copy thereof has been handed over to the counsel for the petitioners.

3. In paragraph No.5 of the status report, it has been mentioned that on the basis of representation dated 31.01.2025, one cross-version case under Sections 117(2)/126/298/303(2)/3(5) of BNS, 2023, has already been registered vide DDR No.37, dated 09.03.2025, at P.S. Jhabal, District Tarn Taran, against respondents No.4 & 5 i.e. Sukhwant Singh and Gurpratap Singh, respectively.

Paragraph No.5 of the status report is reproduced here-under:-

“5. That as far as the Representation dated 31.01.2025 (Annexure P-5) moved by the petitioner No.2 namely Sukhwant Kaur before the office of Senior Superintendent of Police, Tarn Taran is concerned, it is submitted that the verification pertaining to the above said representation has been conducted by the Deputy Superintendent of Police (Detective), District Tarn Taran and during the course of verification, it has emerged on record that one cross version case under Section 117(2)/126/298/303(2)/3(5) of BNS has already been registered vide DDR No.37 dated 09.03.2025 incorporated at PS Jhabal, District Tarn Taran against the respondent No.3 namely Sukhwant Singh and respondent No.4 namely Gurpratap Singh, on the basis of statement got recorded by the petitioner No.1 namely Balbir Singh and no further/separate action is required to be taken on the above said Representation and after conducting verification, the Enquiry Officer recommended the filing of the above said Representation.”

4. In view of the status report filed by the State today in this Court, I do not find any reason to continue with the proceedings of the present petition.

Accordingly, present petition stands **disposed of**.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

March 12, 2025

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No