



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

220

COC-1322-2025

Date of Decision: 31.10.2025

Jaswinder Kaur

.....Petitioner

Vs.

Kuldeep Chahal

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUDEEPTI SHARMA

Present: Mr. Mohit Kumar, Advocate for
Mr. G.S. Sidhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ravneet Singh Joshi, DAG, Punjab

SUDEEPTI SHARMA J. (Oral)

1. The present contempt petition has been filed for deliberate and intentional disobedience of order dated 30.07.2024 passed by this Court in CWP-2066-2018.

2. The relevant portion of order dated 30.07.2024 passed by this Court in CWP-2066-2018 is reproduced as under:-

“In view of the above, it would be appropriate to dispose of the present petition with the following directions:-

i) State of Punjab is directed to ensure that whenever a complaint is made which reflects commission of cognizable offence, an FIR ought to be registered in terms of the law laid down by the Apex Court in Lalita Kumari’s case (supra).



ii) The provisions of the Pre-Conception and Pre-Natal Diagnostic Techniques Act, 1994 be followed in its letter and spirit.”

3. In compliance of order dated 30.07.2024 passed by this Court in CWP-2066-2018, compliance affidavit of Swapan Sharma, IPS, Commissioner of Police, Ludhiana, district Ludhiana, dated 02.04.2025 along with Annexures R-1/T, R-2/T and R-3/T has been filed and is taken on record.

4. As per para 3 of the compliance affidavit, the complaint was dealt with and the report of ADCP-3, Ludhiana dated 06.06.2018 is also attached with the compliance affidavit as Annexure R-1/T. Thereafter, the petitioner moved another application PGD No.2071711 dated 19.07.2023 which was again dealt with and the report of ACP, Emergency Response, Ludhiana dated 10.05.2024 is attached as Annexure R-2/T.

5. The relevant portion of compliance affidavit of Swapan Sharma, IPS, Commissioner of Police, Ludhiana, district Ludhiana, dated 02.04.2025 is reproduced as under:-

“8. That by deliberately concealing the aforesaid report(s) and with the intent to circumvent the due process of law, the petitioner has filed the present petition. It is pertinent to submit that an enquiry had already been conducted with respect to the same subject matter, pursuant to an application moved by the petitioner's mother-in-law, wherein a recommendation was made to file the application. It is further submitted that the petitioner's mother-in-law has not challenged the said enquiry report either before any superior authority or before a court of competent jurisdiction. In such



circumstances, neither a fresh enquiry can be legally initiated nor any FIR can be registered on the same cause of action, as the same would amount to multiple enquiry, which is not permissible as per the standing orders passed by the DGP, Punjab.

9. That furthermore, the petitioner has not uttered even a single word that the plot in question has been transferred in her name. In such situation, the petitioner has no cause of action to file the present petition.

10. That it is also relevant to mention here that during the enquiry, Kuldeep Singh, Hawaldar who is in possession of the plot in question on the basis of registered sale deed dated 15.07.2009 executed in the name of his wife Gurwinder Kaur, has produced copy of plaint (Civil suit) filed by Amarjit Kaur, mother-in-law of petitioner, in the year 2017, which was dismissed in default on 01.03.2018 by the Ld. Civil Court.

11. That furthermore, Amarjit Kaur, mother-in-law of petitioner filed another case CIS No.CS-3195/2018 in the Ld. Trial court and the same was also dismissed in default by the Ld. Civil Court vide order dated 06.04.2023.

12. That during enquiry, it is proved on record that Kuldeep Singh Hawaldar had purchased the plot in question in the name of his wife Gurwinder Singh from Karamjit Singh on 15.07.2009 and since then he is in possession of the same. It is evident that the petitioner's mother-in-law has already approached the ld. Civil Court twice on identical claims and failed to pursue both suits, resulting in their dismissal in default. Despite this, the petitioner has not come forward on the very same set of allegations which were not pursued earlier by her mother-in-law, which have already been dismissed by ld. Civil Court.



13. That the order dated 30.07.2024 passed in National Anti- Crime and Human Rights Protection of India Vs State of Punjab and Others decided is no applicable to the facts of this case. There is no violation or dis-obedience of any order but the petitioner, with ulterior motive and to put pressure upon the police to register FIR, has filed the present petition.”

6. A perusal of the compliance affidavit dated 02.04.2025 as well as the reports attached as Annexures R-1/T, R-2/T and R-3/T with the compliance affidavit shows that order dated 30.07.2024, passed by this Court in CWP-2066-2018 has been complied with.

7. In view of the above, the contempt is purged and rule is discharged.

8. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)
JUDGE

September 31st 2025
Sahil

Whether speaking/non-speaking : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No