

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

(144)

**CRM-M-17306 of 2026
Date of Decision: 06.04.2026**

JP (name not disclosed)

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE KIRTI SINGH

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


Ms. Guramrit Kaur, DAG, Punjab.

KIRTI SINGH, J. (ORAL)

1. This petition has been filed under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (earlier Section 482 of Cr.P.C.) seeking appropriate direction to the respondents to supply the copy of decision so taken by the DSP, Mansa, on the representation dated 06.10.2025.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in the petition bearing CRM-M-32154-2025 filed by the petitioner seeking cancellation of anticipatory bail granted to the respondent No.7 in case FIR No.160 dated 25.12.2024, the learned State counsel had, on instructions from ASI Sukhdev Singh, made a statement that the representation dated 06.10.2025 had duly been considered by the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Mansa and thereafter consigned to the record room. It was thereupon that the said petition was withdrawn on 06.03.2026. It is submitted that however, the decision so taken by the DSP Mansa has neither been brought on record nor

supplied to the petitioner or her counsel and hence, the petitioner is totally



unaware as to what decision has been taken.

3. Notice of motion.

4. At the asking of the Court, Ms. Guramrit Kaur, DAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of respondents No. 1 to 6-State. She has vehemently opposed the prayer made by the learned counsel for the petitioner.

5. Perusal of the case record shows that the present petition is premature and not maintainable in the absence of a clear cause of action. The Grievance made is that the copy of the decision taken by the DSP Mansa on the representation dated 06.10.2025 has not been supplied to the petitioner. However, there is no material placed on record to demonstrate that the petitioner had ever approached the competent authority seeking a copy of the said decision and that such a request was refused.

6. As such, no ground is made out to invoke the extraordinary jurisdiction of this Court, particularly when efficacious alternative remedies to seek the requisite information from the competent authority are available with the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the instant petition stands dismissed.

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

(KIRTI SINGH)
JUDGE

April 06, 2026
Ritika

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