

COCP-1548-2022

Date of Decision : 11.11.2022

JASWINDER KAUR

...Petitioner

Versus

DEEPAK PARIKH, SSP PATIALA

....Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice B.S. WaliaPresent : Mr. Bhupinder Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Vishal Goel, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajesh Mehta, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

B.S. Walia, J. (Oral)

[1] Prayer in the petition is for initiating proceedings against the respondent for intentional and willful defiance of order, Annexure P/1, dated 07.12.2021 in CRM-M No.51157 of 2021 in case titled as Jaswinder Kaur vs. State of Punjab and others.

[2] A perusal of order, Annexure P/1 reveals that CRM-M No.51157 of 2021 was disposed of by directing the Senior Superintendent of Police, Patiala to decide representation dated 02.12.2021 filed by the petitioner within two weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of the order.

[3] Learned Addl. A.G. refers to report, Annexure R-1/T dated 14.01.2022 attached to the reply dated 24.08.2022 as per which on the basis of enquiry conducted it had been found that there were cases going on between the parties and that Kamal Thakur had got registered case No.194/16 at Police Station Tripri, Patiala against the petitioner's husband namely Kuldeep Singh for defrauding him besides case No.505 dated 17.12.2019 under Sections 420 and 120-B IPC was registered at Police

Station City Barnala, District Barnala against Kuldeep Singh and his accomplice Priya D/o Surjit Singh and in view thereof, the Senior Superintendent of Police ordered filing of the application filed by the petitioner in view of no truth having been found in the same while compliance report, Annexure R/2-T dated 20.01.2022 (copy of intimation sent by the Senior Superintendent of Police, Patiala to the Assistant Registrar (Criminal) of this Court) mentions that in view of the enquiry report submitted by the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Rural, Patiala, District Patiala, no further police action was required to be taken in the matter as representation dated 02.12.2021 filed by the petitioner had been consigned to the record. Copy of the reply along with report (Annexure R-1/T) and compliance report (Annexure R-2/T) has already been supplied to learned counsel for the petitioner, who states that in view of reply dated 24.08.2022, report (Annexure R-1/T) dated 14.01.2022 and compliance report (Annexure R-2/T) dated 20.01.2022, he does not press the instant petition but prays for grant of liberty to the petitioner to challenge the decision of the respondent by way of appropriate proceedings in accordance with law.

[4] In view of the position noted above, as well as statement of learned counsel for the petitioner, the instant petition is *disposed of* as not calling for any action against the respondent under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 while granting liberty to the petitioner as prayed for.

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

11.11.2022
'Amit'

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