



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

CRM-M No.50735 of 2024
Date of decision: 30th January, 2025

Baljinder Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab & others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Parvesh K. Banwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

1. The instant petition under Section 528 of the BNSS has been filed alleging serious irregularities and fraudulent practices by the private respondents.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the private respondents are operating an organized racket involving bail bonds and sureties, extracting exorbitant amounts from accused persons and their families while repeatedly using same jama-bandis and sale-deeds in multiple cases. Further, it is alleged that they are engaged in fabricating fraudulent Aadhaar Cards, counterfeit driving licenses, and fake caste certificates, as well as misusing Govt. schemes.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he had previously approached respondent No.2 vide representation dated 16.07.2024 (Annexure P-2) to bring these alleged malpractices to the

notice of the authorities. However, it has been asserted that no action has been taken in response.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the relevant material on record.

5. Before examining the allegations, it is imperative to consider whether the petitioner has the requisite *locus standi* to maintain the present petition.

6. The doctrine of *locus standi* is a fundamental principle in judicial proceedings that determines whether a party has the legal standing to bring a matter before the Court. In general, only a person who has suffered a direct legal injury or has a vested personal interest in the outcome of a case is permitted to invoke the jurisdiction of the Court. The rationale behind this rule is to ensure that judicial processes are not misused by individuals who are neither directly affected by a dispute nor have any legitimate interest in its resolution.

7. While Courts may, in exceptional cases, relax the requirement of *locus standi* in matters of grave public interest, such relaxation is only granted when the petitioner demonstrates that the issue involves a blatant violation of legal principles, miscarriage of justice, or abuse of process affecting the larger public good. However, the present case does not fall within such an exception.

8. When specifically questioned by this Court about his *Locus Standi*, learned counsel for the petitioner was unable to offer a satisfactory explanation as to how the petitioner is personally aggrieved or why he should be allowed to invoke this Court's inherent jurisdiction

under Section 528 of BNSS. The allegations, though serious in nature and primarily concerning purported fraudulent activities involving Govt. documents and judicial proceedings are extremely vague and generic. They fail to specify any particular instance or provide details of a single identifiable incident.

9. The power under Section 528 BNSS is to be exercised sparingly and with caution. It is intended to prevent abuse of process or to secure the ends of justice but cannot be invoked in a routine manner by persons who have no direct cause of action. Allowing such petitions without proper legal standing would open the floodgates for indiscriminate litigation and burden the courts with cases where the petitioner has no real stake in the matter.

10. In light of the above discussion, this Court finds that the petitioner lacks the necessary *locus standi* to maintain this petition. Without delving into the merits of the allegations, the present petition is dismissed.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

January 30, 2025
rps

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