



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

116

CRM-M-30175-2026(O&M)

Date of decision: 25.05.2026

Surinder Kaur

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Punjab and others

...Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Gurjant Singh Bhullar, Advocate for the petitioner.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed for seeking issuance of directions to conduct a fair, impartial, independent, effective and time-bound investigation in case bearing FIR No.0076 dated 28.04.2026 registered under Section 111 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023; Section 25 of the Arms Act; Sections 3, 4, 5 of the Explosive Substances Act, 1908 and Sections 13, 16, 18, and 20 of the Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967 at Police Station Kotwali, District Patiala and also to take action on the representation dated 06.05.2026 submitted by the petitioner.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the police officials of the CIA Staff, Patiala, along with other police officials, forcibly picked up Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi, i.e. husband of the petitioner herein, from his shop situated at Goindwal Bypass, Tarn Taran. Thereafter, the above-said FIR has been registered. The police officials showed that the husband of the petitioner was being picked up from Patiala, whereas he was unlawfully picked up by the officials of the CIA Staff from Tarn Taran. He further contends that the remand papers submitted before the Illaqa Magistrate were false and fabricated and that a 10-day police remand

was also obtained by the respondent-authorities. He further contends that the petitioner submitted a representation dated 06.05.2026 to the DGP, Punjab, requesting a fair investigation, but no action was taken thereupon.

3. The arguments of the learned counsel for the petitioner about the investigation not being conducted fairly are, however, not corroborated. Reliance on the photographs, appended as Annexure P-7, at this stage, does not prove that the petitioner was forcibly taken away by the CIA Staff. The petitioner has appended some photographs of a fruit shop pertaining to 28.04.2026; however, the same do not establish her plea. Nor do the said photographs show the manner in which the petitioner was picked up on the said date. Besides, it cannot be ascertained from the said photographs that the same belong to Tarn Taran or to some other place. Still further, there is nothing on record to suggest that any objection in this regard was raised by the husband of the petitioner at the time of submission of the remand papers before the concerned Court, nor is there anything to indicate what order, if any, was passed thereupon.

4. There is also no allegation of any malice, ill-will or any ulterior motive on the part of the investigating agency to implicate the petitioner's husband in a false case. No specific allegations of unfair investigation have been levelled against any particular officer, nor have such officers been impleaded as parties to the present proceedings.

5. Under the given circumstances, it cannot be assumed that the investigating agency would not carry out a fair investigation. Under the garb of such prayers and such wild allegations, a person portraying himself as a person aggrieved should not be permitted to steer the investigation or elect

the investigating agency of his choice.

6. The position in law is well settled that the course of investigation is ordinarily not to be interfered with by the Court. No such compelling circumstances have been shown to exist in the present case that would warrant an interference or supervision by this Court.

7. Consequently, the present petition is dismissed.

8. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

25.05.2026

Sumit Gusain

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