



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

**Sr.No.131**

**CRM-M-14238-2026  
Decided on : 17.03.2026**

Jaswant Singh Cheema and another

..... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

..... Respondents

**CORAM : HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL**

\*\*\*

Present : Mr. Rajiv Kataria, Advocate  
for the petitioners.

\*\*\*

**RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J (ORAL)**

1. The petitioner has preferred the instant petition under Section 528 of BNSS for transfer of the investigation of FIR No.22 dated 25.01.2026, registered under Sections 109, 125, 324(4), 351 (2) of BNS, 2023 and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959, at Police Station Doraha to any place outside the district of Ludhiana/Khanna.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that one Guneet Bhatia alongwith 30-40 persons forcibly entered the office of petitioner No.1 and threatened him with deadly weapons. He further submits that against the said incident, the police did not take any action, therefore, the petitioner submitted a written complaint (Annexure P-1). Learned counsel submits that thereafter the aforesaid persons fired shots at the car of petitioners and on the statement of petitioner(s), the said FIR (Annexure P-2) was registered

against the unknown persons. Learned counsel further contends that despite



the fact that the petitioners specifically named Guneet Bhatia in his statement, the police registered the FIR against unknown persons. Learned counsel contends that the police called the petitioners for investigation and demanded Rs.25,00,000/- from petitioner No.2 and threatened that if he does not pay the said amount, he would be involved in a false case. Thereafter, petitioner No.2 filed a petition before this Court which was later on dismissed as withdrawn. The petitioner again made a request (Annexure P-4) for registration of FIR against Guneet Bhatia, his father Chandan Bhatia and other persons. Learned counsel contends that as no action was taken by the police, the petitioner again filed a representation dated 05.02.2026 (Annexure P-6). Learned counsel for the petitioners further contends that the police is protecting the accused persons, therefore, he prays to transfer the investigation of the case from Khanna/Ludhiana to any other district.

3. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners and perused the paper book.

4. There is no evidence on record which shows that the police had openly demanded an amount of Rs.25,00,000/- from petitioner No.2. Further, there is no evidence available on record on the basis whereof it may be prima facie held that the Investigating Agency/Investigating Officer is not conducting the investigation in a fair manner. A mere dissatisfaction of the petitioners cannot be perceived as a derogation from the settled principle of investigation. Besides, entertaining any such unsubstantiated allegations in petition shall amount to steer investigation merely by levelling allegations against an Investigating Officer who may not seem to be favouring him. Hence, there is a great potential of misuse of any such undue indulgence.

The burden lies on the person seeking transfer of investigation to establish as



to how he is prejudiced and as to how the investigation is unfair or partisan which the petitioners fail to discharge.

5. Under the given circumstances, this Court does not find any plausible ground insofar as claim made by the petitioners for seeking transfer of investigation to any place outside the district of Ludhiana/Khanna.

6. Accordingly, the instant petition is dismissed.

17.03.2026  
mamta

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL )  
JUDGE

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