



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

**CRM-M-42083-2023**

**Date of Decision : 24.07.2024**

**JAGMAL SINGH AND OTHERS**

.....Petitioners

***VERSUS***

**STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS**

.....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI**

Present : Mr. Gaurav Singh, Advocate,  
for the petitioners.

Mr. Bhupender Singh, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. J.P.Jangu, Advocate  
for respondent no.6.

**KULDEEP TIWARI, J.(Oral)**

1. Through the instant petition, prayer is made for issuance of directions upon official respondents no.2 and 3 not to continue with the inquiry initiated on the basis of complaint given by private respondent no.6/complainant as police authority of District Rohtak, has no jurisdiction over the matter, and the complaint has already been inquired into by Economic Offence Wing, Yamunanagar, after being marked by the Head Office.

2. Upon a response sought from the State regarding the allegations as made in the instant petition, a reply, dated 23.09.2023, was filed.

3. As per the reply (*supra*) the complaint was preferred by respondent no.6 (Annexure P-2), to the Inspector General of Police, Chief Minister, Flying Squad, Panchkula. Subsequently, this complaint was marked to the Economic Cell, Yamunanagar, for inquiry through the Superintendent of Police, Yamunanagar. Thereupon, the inquiry was initiated by the Economic Cell, Yamunanagar, and during inquiry the statements of petitioners were recorded, however respondent no.6/complainant did not cause appearance, despite numerous summons, rather he sent an application through Whatsapp to respondent no.4, i.e. the Superintendent of Police, Yamunanagar, that he has already moved a similar complaint to the Superintendent of Police, Rohtak, and same is being inquired into by the Superintendent of Police Rohtak, therefore, his application pertaining to District Yamunanagar, be closed.

4. In view of the above application of the complainant coupled with the fact that he did not turn up to join inquiry being conducted by respondent no.5-SHO/Incharge, Police Station Economic Offence Wing, Yamunanagar, the complaint in question was recommended to be closed without any order of further action.

5. From the facts as discussed above, it clearly transpires that it is not a case of multiple inquiries, as the inquiry at District Yamunanagar, has been closed without any conclusion and at present only one inquiry is being conducted, i.e. by the police authority of District Rohtak. Therefore, the plea raised by learned counsel for the petitioners is in fact, a misconceived plea. Rather it is open for the police at Rohtak to conduct a preliminary inquiry on the allegation which are primarily of economic

offence to reach a conclusion whether any cognizable offence is made out or not.

5. Another issue as raised by learned counsel for the petitioners that the police authority of District Rohtak, has not territorial jurisdiction, cannot be adjudicated by this Court at this stage, however, it is open for the petitioners to join inquiry and raise this objection including all other pleas as available to the petitioners, before the inquiry officer concerned.

6. In view of the above, this Court does not find any merit in the instant petition, therefore, the relief (*supra*), as sought, cannot be granted at this stage.

7. Consequently, the instant petition is ordered to be **dismissed**, however, with aforesaid liberty.

July 24, 2024  
*dharamvir*

(KULDEEP TIWARI)  
JUDGE

|                            |   |        |
|----------------------------|---|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned. | : | Yes/No |
| Whether Reportable.        | : | Yes/No |