



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

(221)

CWP-6788-2018

Date of Decision : 07.07.2025

Kuljit Singh Sidhu

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. Akash Patyal, Advocate for
Mr. Mohinder Singh Joshi, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sahil R. Bakshi, AAG, Punjab.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J.(ORAL)

1. Through the instant writ petition, cast under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, a prayer is made for issuance of a mandamus, upon the respondent No.2, to conclude the enquiry pending with Superintendent of Police (D), within a time frame, and to take action in accordance with law, and to ensure that petitioner and his family may not be harassed at the hands of private respondents, and/or to decide representation of petitioner Annexure P-4.

2. During the pendency of the instant writ petition, various status reports have been filed. What reflects from the study survey of the status reports is that the complaint had already been examined, and after the conclusion of the enquiry, it was ordered to be filed by the competent authority concerned. Therefore, the prayer as made through the instant writ petition has already been rendered infructuous, as the enquiry has already been concluded.



3. Furthermore, in case, the petitioner still has any grievance with regard to the outcome of the enquiry, he is at liberty to avail all other alternate efficacious remedies, as may be available to him, in accordance with law.

4. Consequently, the instant writ petition is **dismissed as having been rendered infructuous.**

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

July 07, 2025
Manpreet

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