



**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
at Chandigarh**

141

CRM-M-45185-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 29.01.2026

Dilbagh Singh ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another ... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present:- Mr. Amritpal Singh Maan, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Anup Singh, AAG, Punjab.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 528 of BNSS for quashing of FIR No.153 dated 23.09.2022 registered under Sections 447, 511, 427, 380, 506, 148 and 149 of IPC at Police Station City Batala along with challan dated 17.12.2022.
2. The present FIR was registered on the statement of Mangal Sen Kohli, who stated that his son and daughter-in-law are the owners in possession of a plot measuring approximately 233 square yards. The said plot was duly registered in their favour by Vishwajit Kumar and Sale on 28.02.2013, and since then they have been in continuous possession of the same. On 23.09.2022, when the son and daughter-in-law were in Delhi, the complainant Mangal Sen, while returning home from Dana Mandi to have food, was passing by the said plot and noticed that the backside door and a



CRM-M-45185-2025 (O&M)

(2)

wall were being demolished by Dilbagh Singh along with other persons. Upon seeing this, the complainant, accompanied by his friends, reached the spot and objected to the illegal acts, requesting the accused persons not to cause any damage. However, the accused continued demolishing the wall, abused and threatened the complainant, claimed ownership of the plot, and attempted to forcibly take possession of the same. It is further stated that the accused persons had earlier also attempted to illegally occupy the said plot, in respect of which a civil suit is pending before the Court of the learned Civil Judge (Senior Division), Batala, wherein a stay order has also been granted. Despite the said stay, the accused again attempted to take forcible possession of the plot. The accused persons also removed and stole old electrical equipment belonging to the caretaker, Surjit Singh, including three to four bundles of electrical wire.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the dispute is of civil in nature which is being given criminal colour. No offence under Section 447, 511, 427, 380, 506, 148 and 149 of IPC is made out from the contents of the FIR.

4. Learned State counsel contended that, on the basis of the material available on record relating to the property dispute annexed with the petition, a prima facie case is made out, and accordingly, the trial Court has framed charges against the petitioner vide order dated 09.05.2025.

5. Heard.

6. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the material on record *inter alia* the contents of the impugned FIR, this court



CRM-M-45185-2025 (O&M) (3)

does not find merits in the contentions of the petitioner. The offences alleged in the FIR are figured out *prima facie* from the contents of the FIR. It is well settled principle of law that while exercising power under Section 482 Cr.P.C., the Court is not required to conduct a mini trial qua its satisfaction relating to the reliability or genuineness of the allegations made in the FIR. The Court has only to consider whether the allegations in the FIR *prima facie* shows the commission of the cognizable offence.

7. Keeping in view the above, the present petition is hereby dismissed being devoid of merits.

29.01.2026
Geeta

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking /reasoned	Yes / No
Whether Reportable	Yes / No