

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH.

224

CWP-6788-2018 (O&M).

Date of Decision: 13.12.2022.

Kuljit Singh

..Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab and others

.. Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present None for the petitioner.

Mr. H.S.Sitta, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. S.S. Aviraj, Advocate,
for respondents No.4 to 6 and 9.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

The instant writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, praying for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing respondent No.2 to conclude the inquiry pending with the Superintendent of Police (D) in a time bound manner and to take appropriate action in accordance with law.

Pursuant to the order dated 06.09.2019, status report on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3 by way of affidavit of Mr. Surinder Kumar, PPS, Superintendent of Police (Investigation), Mansa, District Mansa has been filed today in the Court.

It has been averred in the aforesaid status report that in compliance to the order dated 06.09.2019, the re-investigation (inquiry) was carried out by the Superintendent of Police (Investigation), Mansa, District Mansa on the representation submitted by the petitioner. As per the enquiry

conducted by the office, no cognizable offence was found to be made out under the provisions of the Indian Penal Code or under the Information and Technology Act. Resultantly, the complaint was recommended to be filed.

Learned State counsel contends that the grievance of the petitioner was solely for issuance of directions to expeditiously conclude the inquiry on the complaint submitted and the needful having been done there is no further cause of action.

Learned State counsel also contends that an additional prayer has been made in the petition for seeking security and for protection of life and liberty of the petitioner as well as members of his family. He contends that the incident which has been stated in the petition has also been inquired into by the investigating agency and the said incident was not found to be correct.

There is no representation on behalf of the petitioner.

It appears that the petitioner is no more interested in pursuing the present petition.

Dismissed for non prosecution.

December 13, 2022.
raj arora

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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