



CWP-31349-2025 (O&M)

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

121

CWP-31349-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 19.03.2026

Heena

...Petitioner

Versus

Union of India and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present: - Ms. Rashi Vashisht, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Arvind Seth, Senior Panel Counsel
for Union of India-respondent Nos.1 and 3

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking direction to respondents to consider and decide her representation dated 30.04.2025 regarding immigration fraud and misuse of documents by respondents Nos.5 to 8.

2. The petitioner is estranged wife of respondent No.5. Multiple cases are pending before Civil/Criminal Courts between petitioner and private respondents. The petitioner is claiming that respondent No.6 sent sponsorship to respondent No.5 for obtaining U.K. Visa. The relationship of respondent Nos.5 and 6 was shown as mother-son. The respondent applied for Visitor's Visa wherein he disclosed name of his mother as Tripta Devi @ Darshna. The petitioner filed complaint before police authorities seeking action against private respondents. She filed CRM-M-11872-2025 before this Court seeking direction to Senior Superintendent of Police, Jalandhar to consider her representation. Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub-Division



Nakodar conducted investigation and found that as per photocopy of the sponsorship letter, Tripta Devi is mentioned as mother of Navdeep Sandhir. The passports issued to Navdeep Sandhir by Regional Passport Officer, Jalandhar do not disclose Tripta Devi as mother of Navdeep Sandhir. Despite these facts, file was closed on the ground that Tripta Devi and Navdeep Sandhir are staying out of country and their participation in the inquiry is necessary. The petitioner filed representation dated 30.04.2025 seeking action against private respondents for committing immigration fraud.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that respondent-police is not taking action on the ground that alleged accused are staying out of country.

4. In view of orders passed by this Court, the jurisdictional police authority has already conducted investigation. The alleged accused who are none else but close relatives of the petitioner are staying out of country. If the petitioner is not satisfied with the investigation, she has remedy to approach Criminal Court. This Court while exercising powers under Article 226 of the Constitution of India does not find it appropriate to ask authorities to register FIR or take coercive steps against private respondents. It is apt to notice that multiple cases are pending between petitioner and private respondents. The petitioner on the earlier occasion filed petition under Section 528 of BNSS and now has invoked writ jurisdiction of this Court.

5. In the wake of above discussion and findings, this Court is of the considered opinion that present petition deserves to be dismissed and accordingly dismissed.



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

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

19.03.2026
Mohit Kumar

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