

2026.PHHC.067065



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

264

CRM-M-36576-2024 (O&M)

Date of decision: 30.04.2026

Sikandar Singh**...Petitioner****Versus****State of Punjab and others****...Respondents****CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA**

Present:- Mr. Naveen Batra, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ekampal Sagoo, AAG, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. (*which corresponds to Section 528 of BNSS*) making prayer to call for status report in case FIR No.189 dated 02.11.2019 under Sections 420 of IPC registered at P.S. City Rupnagar, District Rupnagar and further to direct the respondent No.2 to take action against respondents No.4 and 5 in accordance with law.

2. While issuing notice of motion on 02.08.2024, the following order was passed by this Court:

“...2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, contends that the petitioner had lodged the FIR (Annexure P-1) way back in 2019 but the police is not taking any action against respondent No. 5 despite the fact that her bail application bearing No. CRM-M-4675-2024 was declined by this Court vide Annexure P-2 way back on

2026.PHHC.067065



30.01.2024. He contends that the petitioner is openly visiting the office of higher police officials and moving repeated applications, latest being Annexure P-4 dated 18.03.2024 but despite that the police is not arresting her nor presenting the challan in accordance with law whereas in the meanwhile, respondent No.4 had been extending threats to the petitioner forcing him to effect compromise.

3. Notice of motion.

4. On the asking of the Court, Mr. Ankit Grewal, DAG, Punjab, who is present in Court, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and seeks time to file the status report/reply.

5. Adjourned to 27.08.2024.

6. Let the specific reply of respondent No.2- Senior Superintendent of Police, Rupnagar, be filed on or before the next date of hearing with an advance copy to the opposite counsel.”

2. Upon notice, status report/reply has been filed on behalf of the official respondents. In terms of the same, learned State counsel has submitted that abovementioned FIR No.189 was duly registered and the matter has been thoroughly investigated. During the course of investigation, all necessary steps as warranted under law have been taken and the role of the concerned persons has been examined on the basis of available evidence. With regard to the grievance of the petitioner seeking arrest of private respondents, it is submitted that arrest is not mandatory in every case and depends upon the facts and circumstances of each case. The investigating agency is competent to take an independent decision in this regard. It is further submitted that no cognizable material has been found warranting any further action against



respondents No.4 and 5 beyond what has already been undertaken. The allegations of threat and coercion are vague and not substantiated by any credible material. Learned State counsel also submits that the petitioner has an efficacious alternative remedy to approach the learned Magistrate in case he is aggrieved by the investigation conducted. Hence, it is urged that the petition is liable to be dismissed.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner could not dispute the aforementioned facts and has submitted that the petition may be disposed of granting liberty to the petitioner to avail his alternative remedy in accordance with law.

4. In view of the above, the present petition is disposed of with the liberty as prayed for.

30.04.2026

Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

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