



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

Sr. No.129

COC-3277-2025

Date of Decision: 04.09.2025

JAGJIT SINGH

....Petitioner

Versus

**GAURAV TOORA, SENIOR SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE,
DISTRICT KAPURTHALA**

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ARCHANA PURI

Present:- Mr. Atul Jain, Advocate for
Mr. Sandeep Arora, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Jagriti Kalia, AAG, Punjab
for the respondent.

ARCHANA PURI, J. (Oral)

The petitioner-Jagjit Singh has filed the present contempt petition, under Section 10 read with Section 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, for initiation of the contempt proceedings, against the respondent, for violation of the order dated 24.04.2025, passed by the Coordinate Bench, in CRM-M-29146-2024, copy whereof is Annexure P-1.

Heard.

Initially, Jagjit Singh-petitioner had filed the petition i.e. CRM-M-29146-2024, against the State of Punjab, Senior Superintendent of Police, Kapurthala, Station House Officer, Kapurthala and the private respondents. This petition was filed for issuance of directions to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Kapurthala, as well as Station House Officer,



Police Station Sultanpur Lodhi, District Kapurthala, for taking appropriate legal action against the private respondents i.e. Neeraj Sethi and Varinder Sethi, who had made murderous assault upon the petitioner and also snatched an amount of Rs.2,77,000/- from him. The said criminal miscellaneous petition was taken up by the Coordinate Bench on 24.04.2025 and after hearing the petitioner and the other side, the following order was passed:-

“XXX XXX XXX

In view of the limited prayer made by the petitioner, without commenting anything on the merits of the case, the present petition is disposed of at this stage with a direction to respondent No.2 to decide the aforesaid representation dated 06.05.2024 (Annexure P-4) of the petitioner within a period of one month, by passing a speaking order in accordance with law.”

Now, it is submitted that no further action, as ordered by the Coordinate Bench, was taken on the representation.

However, learned State Counsel submits that necessary compliance of the aforesaid order, was in fact made. Rather, she makes reference to the compliance affidavit of Senior Superintendent of Police, Kapurthala, wherein he has given the detail of manner of dealing with the representation made. The necessary paragraph, thereby depicting the compliance of the order is paragraph No.4, which is reproduced as hereingiven:-

“XXX XXX XXX

4. That on the perusal of the record, the following points have come on record, which are stated herein below for the kind perusal of this Hon'ble Court: -



I. That at the very outset, the petitioner had submitted a representation before the office of the then Senior Superintendent of Police, District Kapurthala which was endorsed with UID No. 347358 dated 09.05.2024 (Annexure P-5) and was marked to the then Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub-Division Sultanpur Lodhi, District Kapurthala, to verify the contents of the representation and submit a report.

II. That the petitioner in the abovementioned representation had requested that a criminal case be registered against Varinder Sethi and his son Neeraj Sethi for causing injuries to the complainant/petitioner on 17.04.2024 and it was also requested that the inquiry of the present case be transferred to some other official.

III. That during the inquiry of the said representation (Annexure P-5 in the present contempt petition) the inquiry officer called for the complete record and it was found that a MLR No.HPK/29/CH/SPL/2024 dated 17.04.2024 of the petitioner Jagjit Singh was recorded and 2 injuries were found to be inflicted upon the petitioner, which were declared blunt in nature and referred for x-ray opinion. That statement of petitioner is recorded in the presence of his brother Avtar Singh and on the basis of the statement as well as the MLR, DDR No.13 dated 20.04.2024 of Section 323 IPC was recorded, in accordance with law.

IV. That the complainant in his representation (Annexure P-5 in the present contempt petition) had also alleged that the opposite



party i.e. Varinder Sethi and his son Neeraj Sethi had snatched Rs.2,77,000/- on the date of the incident. In order to verify the said allegations the inquiry officer visited the spot of the incident and got recorded the statements of the shopkeepers of the nearby areas, from which it was found that the shopkeepers were not aware of any such incident which took place, moreover, the complainant/petitioner failed to bring on record any evidence which could prove that the opposite party had snatched Rs. 2, 77,000/- from him. In this regard DDR No. 13 dated 29.06.2024 was recorded.

V. That the inquiry officer had called the petitioner/complainant to come present and get his statement recorded several number of times, however the petitioner/complainant clearly stated that he has filed a case in the Hon'ble Court of law and he will abide by the decision of the Hon'ble Court.

VI. That on the basis of the said statement, the then Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub-Division Sultanpur Lodhi, District Kapurthala had submitted his report dated 03.08.2024, wherein it was recommended that the representation dated 06.05.2024 be consigned to the record room.

That the then Senior Superintendent of Police, District Kapurthala approved the report and the representation was consigned to the record room on 11.08.2024.

VII. That the complainant/petitioner did not supply any medico-legal document and thus, a Letter No. 723/5A dated 14.07.2025 was written to Civil Hospital, Sultanpur Lodhi and the details of



the injuries inflicted on the petitioner were sought.

In reply to the said letter, the opinion of the doctor was received, wherein it was stated that "...As per x-ray report No. JS 97 X No. 2149 dated 18.04.2024 shows no bony injury seen, simple in nature..."

Thus, no further action was required to be taken as DDR No. 13 (Supra) had already been recorded.

VIII. That, however keeping in view the safety and security of the petitioner and in order to ensure that no such incident happens in the future, preventive action under Section 126/170 BNSS was taken against the opposite party i.e. Varinder Sethi and his son namely Neeraj Sethi vide DDR No. 24 dated 18.07.2025, in accordance with law."

From the contents of the aforesaid affidavit, it is evident that the representation was considered by the police authorities and requisite DDR was recorded, keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case. Also, it was verified about there to be no snatching of an amount of Rs.2,77,000/-, as asserted by the petitioner in CRM-M-29146-2024. Furthermore, the consignment of the representation dated 06.05.2024, was made by Senior Superintendent of Police, Kapurthala.

Not only this, even in the succeeding paragraph, it has been specifically mentioned that the petitioner did not cooperate and did not supply copy of the medico legal documents and thereupon, letter was written to the Civil Hospital, Sultanpur Lodhi. In pursuance thereto, opinion of the doctor was received, wherein it was reflected that there was no bony injury seen and the injury was simple in nature.... On the basis thereof, it was



COC-3277-2025

observed that no further action was required, as DDR No.13 dated 20.04.2024, had already been recorded. Even, the police authorities have gone a step further and took preventive steps under Sections 126/170 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, against Varinder Sethi and his son Neeraj Sethi, vide DDR No.24 dated 18.07.2025, in accordance with law.

In these circumstances, in the affidavit, it is submitted that compliance of the order dated 24.04.2025 passed in CRM-M-29146-2024, has been duly made.

Though, counsel for the petitioner has made reference to Annexure R-1 and has submitted about detail qua presence of the witnesses, as well as of the opposite party and the documents presented by both the sides and also about the names and addresses of the persons, including the Investigating Officer of their own, but however, it is pertinent to mention that this information was with regard to the proceedings conducted prior to filing of CRM-M-29146-2024. Rather, from the contents of the affidavit, it is evident that there was no cooperation, at the behest of the petitioner, while making inquiry into the representation, which was ordered to be complied with by the Coordinate Bench.

In view of the aforesaid fact situation, there is no defiance on the part of the respondent. As such, no case is made out for initiation of contempt proceedings.

Accordingly, the contempt petition stands disposed of.

(ARCHANA PURI)
JUDGE

04.09.2025

Himanshu

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