

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

Date of Decision : September 18, 2013

CWP No. 2738 of 2012

Anil Kumar Aggarwal and others

....PETITIONERS

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

.... RESPONDENTS

CWP No. 5087 of 2012

H.C.Arora, Advocate

....PETITIONER

Vs.

State of Punjab and another

.... RESPONDENTS

CWP No. 5110 of 2012

H.C.Arora, Advocate

....PETITIONER

Vs.

State of Haryana and another

... RESPONDENTS

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KISHAN KAUL, CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH**

Present : Mr. V.B.Aggarwal, Advocate,
for the petitioner (in CWP No. 2738 of 2012)

Mr. H.C.Arora, petitioner in person
(in CWP Nos. 5087 and 5110 of 2012)

Mr. Vijay Pal, Advocate,
for respondent No. 2 (in CWP No. 2738 of 2012).

Mr. Gaurav Garg Dhuriwala, Deputy Advocate General,
Punjab.

Mr. Ajay Gupta, Additional Advocate, General, Haryana.

SANJAY KISHAN KAUL, CHIEF JUSTICE (Oral)

These writ petitions raise the issue of implementation of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Parkash Singh and others vs. Union of India and others**, 2006 (8) SCC 1.

We are given to understand that the Hon'ble Supreme Court is already in seisin of this issue and is monitoring the aspect of implementation of the said judgment.

Petitioner appearing in person in two of the writ petitions submits that in view of the aforesaid, the only submission he is making is that the two legislatures in their wisdom having enacted the Punjab Police Act, 2007 and Haryana Police Act, 2007 respectively these Acts should be given full effect to especially as they are stated to be so enacted keeping in mind the observations of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the aforesaid judgment. In this behalf, our attention has been drawn to Section 54 in the Punjab Act and Section 68 in the Haryana Act regarding Constitution of the District Police Complaints Authority in the respective States.

Learned Additional Advocate General for both the States submit that it was felt that in view of there being other authorities, there was no need of this authority at the moment.

We fail to appreciate the aforesaid plea as it is not as if some new authorities have come into being post 2007 enactments, which take care of the complaints envisaged under the aforesaid provisions and thus, both the legislatures consciously in their wisdom have incorporated the aforesaid provisions. No doubt, they would come into effect only when the concerned authorities are notified by the State Governments. It is thus, appropriate that the two states take steps to notify the authorities as envisaged aforesaid under the two respective provisions.

Needful be done within three months.

Petitions, accordingly, stand disposed of.

In case post the final view taken by the Hon'ble Supreme Court on the implementation of the judgment in Parkash Singh' s case (supra), any cause of action arises, the petitioners are at liberty to again approach the Court.

Copy of the order be given dasti under signatures of the Bench Secretary of this Court.

**(SANJAY KISHAN KAUL)
CHIEF JUSTICE**

**(AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH)
JUDGE**

September 18, 2013

pj

सत्यमेव जयते



