



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

201

CRM-M-59326-2024(O&M)

Decided On: 08.04.2025

JASPAL SINGH ALIAS MUNNA AND ANOTHER

....PETITIONER(s)

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

....RESPONDENT(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present: Mr. Shubhkarman Singh Sandhu, Advocate for
Mr. Ranjan Lakharpal, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Satjot Singh Chahal, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. A. S. Khinda, Advocate
for respondents no.5 and 6.

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA J.(Oral)

The petition has been filed seeking a direction to the respondents/State to register FIR against the culprit/private respondents and provide protection to the petitioners as their life is in danger.

2. Learned State counsel has contended that the complaint made by petitioner no.1, Annexure P-1, alleging forceful dispossession from his house by two sitting MLAs, had been duly examined and was found to be false. Despite having been repeatedly asked, the petitioners did not come forward to record their statements. Petitioner no.1 himself is a proclaimed offender in FIR no.56 dated 25.05.2019 under Sections 406 and 420 IPC, registered at Police Station Sadar, Nakodar, and five other criminal cases are pending against him. In this regard, he has referred to the following paragraphs of the reply filed on behalf of the respondents no.1 to 4:

5. That after initiating the inquiry the DSP vide letter/parwana no. 2559-R.D. dated 21.11.2024 intimation had been



sent to the petitioner to come present and present the evidence to support his complaint. That it was reported that the petitioner was not residing at the address mentioned by him. That subsequently vide letter/parwana no. 2607-R.D. dated 28.11.2024 intimation had been sent to the petitioner to come present and present the evidence to support his complaint. That it was reported that the petitioner was not residing at the address mentioned by him. That in addition to this the same was also sent on WhatsApp no. 98142-83331 and the phone was switched off.

6. That as the petitioner could not be contacted the other party were called to present their side. That they outrightly denied the allegations. That to further corroborate their claim the call details were procured and on the date of the incident, i.e. 17.10.2024, the location of the accused was not of the place where the alleged incident took place as per the complaint of the petitioner.

7 and 8 xxx xxx xxx

9. That the deponent would further submit that the petitioner has six cases registered against him. That the details of the cases are as follows:

1. FIR No. 26 dated 08.08.2007 u/s 16-1-14 of the Excise Act registered at PS City Kapurthala.
2. FIR No. 221 dated 12.11.2001 u/s 420 of IPC registered at PS Sultanpur Lodhi.
3. FIR No.169 dated 17.11.2009 u/s 420 of IPC registered at PS Zira, Ferozpur.
4. FIR No. 72 dated 06.03.2014 u/s 376, 506 of IPC registered at PS City Kapurthala.
5. FIR No. 144 dated 30.06.2008 u/s 406, 420, 467, 468 of IPC registered at PS Bolath.
6. FIR No. 56 dated 25.05.2019 u/s 406, 420 of IPC registered at PS Sadar, Nakodar.

10. That it is pertinent to mention that in FIR no. 144 dated 30.06.2008 u/s 406, 420, 467, 468 of IPC, registered at PS Bholath the petitioner had been convicted and it is pertinent to



mention here that in FIR no. 56 dated 25.05.2019 u/s 406, 420 of IPC registered at PS Sadar, Nakodar the petitioner has been declared PO vide order dated 24.02.2020 and he is yet to be arrested in this FIR.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners is not in a position to dispute the facts aforementioned.

4. In view thereof, there is no merit in the petition and it stands dismissed.

5. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stand(s) disposed of.

08.04.2025

Ad

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned?

Yes/No

Whether reportable?

Yes/No