



107

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

COCP-1815-2023

Date of decision: 26.08.2025

KULWINDER SINGH**..Petitioner****Versus****MANDEEP SINGH SIDHU, COMMISSIONER OF POLICE,
LUDHIANA****..Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUDEEPTI SHARMA**

Present: Mr. G.S. Verma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Animesh Sharma, Addl. A.G, Punjab.

SUDEEPTI SHARMA, J. (Oral)

1. The contempt petition has been filed for deliberate and intentional disobedience of order dated 24.01.2023 passed in CRM-M-361-2023 with a direction to the concerned Commissioner of Police to decide representation dated 10.09.2022 within four weeks or by authorizing and delegating it to any officer holding IPS cadre. It was further clarified that such order must be reasoned order and the same be communicated to the representationists without delay.

2. On asking of the Court, Mr. Animesh Sharma, Additional Advocate General, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of State and contends that in compliance of order dated 24.01.2023, compliance report by way of an affidavit of Mr. Mandeep Singh Sidhu (IPS), Commissioner of Police, Ludhiana dated 04.10.2023 along with speaking order dated 11.03.2023, has



been filed, which is attached with the present petition. This fact is not disputed by the learned counsel for the petitioners.

3. The relevant paras of compliance report dated 04.10.2023 are reproduced as under:-

“3. That upon receiving the aforementioned order issued by this Hon'ble Court, the deponent diligently procured a comprehensive report from the ADCP, Zone-II, Ludhiana. Additionally, the deponent meticulously reviewed the entire records pertaining to the present case. Through this thorough examination, the following facts have come to light:

i. That as per the record, the present petitioner had filed a petition, bearing number CRM-M 361 of 2023, before this Hon'ble Court. In the said petition, the petitioner sought the issuance of a direction to the investigating agency i.e. Ludhiana Police to decide the representation dated 10.09.2022 submitted by the petitioner.

ii. That in the aforementioned representation/complaint, the petitioner had formally requested the investigating agency for the registration of a criminal case against individuals, namely Mandeep Singh, Inderjit Singh, Amarpreet Singh, Sunil Kumar, and Davinder Dhawan, under Sections 465, 467, 468, 471, 472, 473, 420, and 120-B of the IPC. The allegations of the petitioner was that the aforementioned individuals had conspired to create a falsified receipt dated 22/09/2015 containing forged signatures of the petitioner. This fabricated receipt falsely indicated that the petitioner had received a substantial sum of Rs 30,81,000/- from Mandeep Singh, Amarpreet Singh, and Inderjit Singh. Sunil Kumar was



allegedly an attestator to the said fraudulent receipt.

iii. That this Hon'ble Court, vide its order dated 24/01/2023 passed in CRM-M-361 OF 2023, had issued a specific direction to decide the aforementioned representation within a time frame of 4 weeks either by the deponent personally or by delegating the responsibility to any officer holding an IPS Cadre. Furthermore, it was explicitly instructed that the outcome of this decision was to be communicated to the petitioner. For the convenience of this Hon'ble Court, the pertinent excerpt from the said order is reproduced hereinbelow:

"Let the representation dated 10.09.2022, Annexure P-3 be decided by the concerned Commissioner of Police-respondent No.4, within four weeks, either himself/herself or by authorizing and delegating it to any officer holding IPS cadre. It is clarified that such order must be a reasoned order, and the same be communicated to the representationists without delay."

4. That in accordance with the directions issued by this Hon'ble High Court, the inquiry pertaining to the aforementioned representation was entrusted by the deponent to the ADCP-Zone-II Ludhiana, who is an IPS Cadre officer. Subsequently, a comprehensive report dated 09/03/2023 was submitted by the aforementioned official wherein, the said officer recommended for filing of the aforesaid representation. This recommendation was based on the fact that a criminal case, i.e. FIR No. 37 dated 09/04/2022 under sections 420, 120-B IPC, had already been registered on the complaint of the petitioner



regarding the same cause of action at PS Dehlon, Ludhiana.

5. That it is pertinent to emphasize that the aforementioned report dated 09/03/2023 was reviewed and approved by the deponent. Subsequently, the deponent issued a reasoned speaking order dated 11/03/2023 regarding this matter. Following the issuance of this order, it was dispatched to the petitioner via post on 15/03/2023. Copy of the speaking order dated 11/03/2023 has been annexed herewith as Annexure R-1/1.”

4. A perusal of compliance report dated 04.10.2023, shows that order dated 24.01.2023 passed in CRM-M-361-2023, has been complied with.

5. In view of the above, the contempt is purged and rule is discharged.

August 26th, 2025

Ayub

**(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)
JUDGE**

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