

CRM-M-21214-2025

-1-

107

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

CRM-M-21214-2025

Date of decision: 12.11.2025

SOM NATH BANGAR

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE KIRTI SINGH

Present: Mr. Inderpreet Singh Kooner, Advocate for the petitioner.


Ms. Aakanksha Gupta, AAG, Punjab.

KIRTI SINGH, J. (ORAL)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 528 BNSS for issuance of appropriate directions to respondent Nos.1 to 5 for conducting investigation of complaint bearing No.6556-PD, dated 17.07.2023, complaint bearing No.2881-SSO dated 30.08.2024 (Annexure P-3) and complaint bearing No.9178-PD, dated 25.12.2024 (Annexure P-7) by some senior police official preferably through Bureau of Investigation, led by a senior officer of the IPS cadre and further directing them to conduct fair, proper and expeditious investigation.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the marriage of the son of the petitioner was solemnized with respondent No.9 on 26.04.2020. Thereafter, she (respondent No.9) was sent abroad on the expense of the petitioner, with the assurance that she would call her husband abroad once she is settled. However, respondent No.9, upon reaching

Canada, refused to send documents required for the son of the petitioner to




CRM-M-21214-2025

-2-

go abroad. In this regard, a complaint No.6556-PD dated 17.07.2023 before the police authorities for registration of case against respondent Nos.6 to 9. During the pendency of the inquiry, the matter was compromised between the parties vide compromise deed dated 05.08.2023 (Annexure P-1), as per which respondent No.9 agreed to cohabit with the son of the petitioner, accordingly the said complaint was closed. However, respondent No.9 resiled from the compromise soon after closure of the complaint. Thereafter, the petitioner filed multiple complaints but to no avail. It is submitted that the private respondents have illegally managed to suppress a fair and impartial inquiry into the matter by filing frivolous petitions before this Court. Further, the police authorities are not taking any action on the complaints moved by the petitioner.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel while placing reliance on the status report filed by PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub-Division Garhshankar, District Hoshiarpur submits that the complaint No.6556-PD dated 17.07.2023 was marked for inquiry to Incharge, EO Wing, Hoshiarpur. During the inquiry, the petitioner made a statement that he has compromised the matter with respondent Nos.6 to 9, as such the complaint may be filed. Consequently, the said complaint was recommended to be filed by SSP, Hoshiarpur. Thereafter, the petitioner again filed an application No.2881-SSP dated 30.08.2024 before the SSP, Hoshiarpur, and the same complaint was duly inquired into. During inquiry it was found that respondent No.8 filed CRWP-8593-2024 before this Court against the petitioner apprehending danger to her life, and in the said petition SSP, Hoshiarpur was directed to file his affidavit. Since the matter was pending



CRM-M-21214-2025

-3-

before this Court, as such the said complaint was ordered to be filed. Lastly, the petitioner filed application No.9178-PD dated 25.12.2024 before SSP, Hoshiarpur against the private respondents. During inquiry it was found that marriage of Mankaran (son of the petitioner) was solemnized with respondent No.9. After marriage, the petitioner spent money from his pocket sent his daughter-in-law to Canada. After reaching Canada, respondent No.9 did not provide required documents for PR of son of the petitioner, thus he could not get permanent residency of Canada. It was concluded that filing of complaints by the petitioner was merely a way to coerce the private respondents through the police to provide required documents by respondent No.9 for permanent residency of the son of the petitioner. Since no prima facie offence was established, it was concluded by the investigating agency that the matter at this stage does not call for police interference, and thus the application was consigned to record.

4. In view of the above, no further order is required to be passed by this Court. Needless to say that the petitioner is at liberty to avail alternate remedies in accordance to law.

5. The instant petition is disposed of accordingly.

Pending application(s), if any, also stands disposed of accordingly.

(KIRTI SINGH)
JUDGE

November 12, 2025

Ithlesh

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