



CRM-M-54033-2025

1

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

129

CRM-M-54033-2025

Date of decision: 29.09.2025

Ranveer Singh

...Petitioner

V/s

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Lupil Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gurmeet Singh, AAG Haryana.

SUMEET GOEL, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (hereinafter to be referred as the 'BNSS, 2023') seeking issuance of direction to respondent Nos.2 to 4 to take strict action against private respondents i.e. respondent Nos.5 to 8 on the basis of complaint dated 04.09.2025 (Annexure P-6) as also to register a criminal case under the relevant sections of the IPC. Further prayer has been made to issue directions to respondent No.3 to consider and decide the complaint dated 04.09.2025 by passing a speaking order within the stipulated time frame.

2. The brief facts of the case as narrated in the present petition are that the petitioner was previously married to one Neetu Rani (respondent No.5 herein) but their marriage was dissolved by mutual consent on 06.05.2025. The petitioner is working in HDFC Bank and one Aparna, daughter of Sanjeev Kumar is working in Axis Bank. The petitioner and the said Aparna performed marriage on 12.05.2025 against the wishes of family

**CRM-M-54033-2025****2**

members of Aparna. Following their marriage, the petitioner and his wife Aparna started receiving threats from the family parents of Aparna and accordingly a representation dated 12.05.2025 was made to the Superintendent of Police, Ambala (Annexure P-4) but no action was taken which compelled the petitioner to approach this Court (i.e. CRWP-4930-2025) for protection. The said petition was disposed off vide order dated 14.05.2025 with a direction to the Superintendent of Police, Ambala to look into the representation and take necessary steps in accordance with law. It was further stated by the petitioner that on 03.09.2025, he was forcibly abducted by respondent Nos.5 to 8 and two unknown persons, who also stole his car, cash and other valuables from Panchkula and was taken to Muradabad, UP where his signatures were fraudulently obtained on blank papers and he was subjected to assault and threats in order to end his relationship with Aparna. However, he escaped on 04.09.2025 and lodged the impugned complaint dated 04.09.2025 (Annexure P-6) with respondent No.3 detailing the facts and seeking intervention. However, no action was taken which compelled the petitioner to approach this Court. It is in this factual backdrop, that the present petition came up for receiving consideration at the hands of this Court.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has iterated that the petitioner was forcibly abducted by respondent Nos.5 to 8 along with two unknown persons and was subjected to assault, threats and coercion to end his marital relationship. Despite submitting a representation to the Superintendent of Police, Ambala (Annexure P-4) and seeking protection from this Court, no effective action has been taken by the police to



CRM-M-54033-2025

3

safeguard the petitioner and his wife. According to learned counsel, in spite of clear disclosure of cognizable offences, respondent Nos.2 to 4 have failed to register an FIR or conduct a fair and proper investigation thereby endangering the life and liberty of the petitioner and his wife. Furthermore, the action of respondent Nos.2 to 4 in the face of material evidence indicate that they are acting in collusion with the accused thereby subverting the course of justice. On the basis of the aforementioned submissions, the grant of the instant petition is entreated for.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel (on the strength of advance notice) has opposed the present petition by arguing that the allegations regarding threats and assault are not corroborated. Furthermore, the State cannot act solely on the version of the petitioner without proper verification. According to learned State counsel, the petitioner has already approached the police and this Court seeking protection but no imminent threat has been established that necessitates invoking of extraordinary intervention by this Court. According to learned State counsel, the apprehensions expressed by the petitioners are wholly misconceived, unfounded and devoid of any merits. On the strength of these submissions, dismissal of the petition in hand is sought for.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the rival parties and have perused the paper-book.

6. It would be apposite to refer herein to a judgment of this Court passed in **CRM-M-34678-2024** titled as **AXXXX vs. vs. State of Punjab and others**, decided on 31.07.2024; relevant whereof reads as under:-

“11. As a sequel to above rumination, the following postulates of law emerge:



I. An Illaqa/Jurisdictional Magistrate has; by virtue of Sections 173 and 175 of BNSS, 2023; the necessary powers and jurisdiction to grant plea(s) for issuance of direction(s) for registration of an FIR, monitoring of investigation in an FIR, change of investigating officer and prayer(s) of alike nature.

II. Ordinarily, an applicant/complainant ought to approach, in the first instance, the Court of Illaqa/Jurisdictional Magistrate to seek prayer(s) for issuance of direction(s) for registration of an FIR, monitoring of investigation in an FIR as also other prayers of akin nature.

III. In a given case, if the facts/circumstances so warrant, the High Court is well within its jurisdiction to entertain and consider plea(s) seeking registration of an FIR, monitoring of investigation in an FIR, constituting an SIT (Special Investigating Team), change of investigating officer & all such prayer(s) of such kind and nature. However, it would be prudent that an applicant/complainant, while seeking to invoke the jurisdiction of a High Court under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023 in the first instance seeking prayer(s) of above nature, shows sufficient cause for not having approached the Illaqa/Jurisdictional Magistrate in the first instance.

IV. A High Court, in its inherent jurisdiction under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023 has unbridled, unfettered and plenary powers. The only restriction on exercise of such powers is self-restraint. No inflexible and comprehensive guidelines can conceivably be enumerated governing the exercise of these intrinsic powers by a High Court under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023. There is no gainsaying that the nature, mode and extent of such exercise of powers by a High Court under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023 shall depend upon the judicial discretion exercised by a High Court in the facts and circumstances of a given case.”

7. The prime prayer made in the petition is the issuance of appropriate directions to take action against respondent Nos.5 to 8 on the basis of complaint dated 04.09.2025 moved by the petitioner. The petitioner has made allegations of abduction and assault but the material placed on record shows lack of independent verification or corroborative evidence. There is no credible evidence on record establishing immediate danger or ongoing threat to the life of the petitioner or the fact that the police has



adopted a negligent and indifferent approach towards the investigation. It appears that the police have received the complaints and representations and they require reasonable time to verify the allegations before the registration of the FIR. Mere dis-satisfaction of the petitioner with the investigative steps does not *ipso facto* render the investigation partial or collusive. There exists no material on record to substantiate the claim of the petitioner that respondent Nos.2 to 4 have failed to register an FIR, in violation of Section 154 of the Cr.P.C. No such accentuating facts/circumstances have been brought forward by the petitioner which may warrant interference by this Court under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023. Accordingly, this Court does not find the present case a fit one for exercise of its jurisdiction under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023.

8. The jurisdiction conferred upon this Court under Section 528 of the BNSS is of an extraordinary and discretionary character, necessitating careful and judicious invocation. It is a trite principle of law that such jurisdiction is not to be exercised in routine or perfunctory matters, but solely in circumstances that unequivocally warrant the intervention of the Court to prevent manifest injustice or irreparable harm. The Court, in the exercise of its extraordinary powers, is not a forum for speculative grievances or unsubstantiated apprehensions. Mere averments or generalized prayers, such as those seeking directions for registration of the case, are insufficient to compel the Court to intervene. The petitioner bears a fundamental and onerous obligation to substantiate his allegations with cogent, credible, and *prima facie* evidence that demonstrates a real and



immediate threat or an act of injustice requiring redress. It would be appropriate to refer herein to an age old adage:

“Judicial judgment must be informed and guided by the evidence on record; speculation or surmises has no place in the Court of Law”

It is well-settled that the extraordinary jurisdiction of the Court is intended to supplement, not supplant, the ordinary remedies available under the general law. This jurisdiction is inherently constrained by the principles of judicial propriety and is invoked only where there exist no efficacious alternative remedy, or where failure to act would result in the miscarriage of justice. Absent sufficient material or evidentiary basis, the Court cannot be compelled to act merely on the asking of petitioner. To do so would undermine the very sanctity and purpose of its extraordinary jurisdiction, reducing it to a mechanism for frivolous or unwarranted claims. In the present instance, the lack of substantive evidence negates any justification for the exercise of such powers, and the Court finds no occasion to intervene in the absence of a clear and compelling case.

9. Accordingly, the instant petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023 stands dismissed.
10. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

September 29, 2025
Ajay

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