



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

(141)

CRM-M-10705-2026

DATE OF DECISION: 07.04.2026

Pawandeep Dhillon and another

.....Petitioners

VERSUS

Baljinder Singh and State of Punjab

.....Respondents

CORAM HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present Mr.Om Pal Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioners.
Mr.Anup Singh, AAG, Punjab.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023 for quashing of complaint No.COMI/535 of 2021 (Annexure P-4) filed by respondent no.1, under Sections 406, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 506 IPC, against the petitioners and some other persons, and summoning order dated 01.08.2025 (Annexure P-5).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that the summoning order is illegal, arbitrary and has been passed without proper appreciation of the material available on record as there are no specific allegations against the petitioners and only the vague and general averments have been made and complete details have been given about the persons who misappropriated the funds/sale proceeds of the Society but the learned trial Court has passed the summoning order (Annexure P-5) in a most casual manner without going into the actual and factual aspect of the matter.

3. Heard.

4. Since the main contention of the learned counsel for the petitioners is against the summoning order, which can be challenged by way



CRM-M-10705-2026 **2**
of an alternative statutory remedy either by filing a revision petition under Section 397 Cr.P.C. or by raising all permissible pleas before the Trial Court at the appropriate stage. It is a settled proposition of law that where an efficacious alternative remedy is available, the inherent jurisdiction under Section 482 Cr.P.C. ought not to be invoked.

5. In this regard, reliance can be placed upon the law laid down by Hon’ble Supreme Court in Neeharika Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. vs. State of Maharashtra (2021) 19 SCC 401, wherein it has been held that the High Court should not ordinarily interfere at an interlocutory stage when statutory remedies are available. Similarly, in State of Haryana vs. Bhajan Lal 1992 Supp (1) SCC 335, the Hon’ble Supreme Court has cautioned that inherent powers are to be exercised sparingly and in exceptional circumstances only.

6. In the present case, no exceptional ground is made out warranting interference by this Court in exercise of its inherent jurisdiction.

7. Accordingly, the present petition is **dismissed**, with liberty to the petitioner to avail the alternative remedy to approach the revisional Court, available to him in accordance with law.

8. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

07.04.2026		(SUBHAS MEHLA)
mamta		JUDGE
	Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
	Whether reportable	Yes/No