



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

213-A

COCP-5677-2025

Date of Decision: 12.03.2026

DR. SUMEET SOFAT

.....Petitioner

Vs.

DR. ANKUR GUPTA, IPS, SSP LUDHIANA RURAL

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUDEEPTI SHARMA

Present: Petitioner in person (through VC).

Mr. Ravneet S. Joshi, DAG, Punjab.

SUDEEPTI SHARMA J. (Oral)

1. The contempt petition has been filed for deliberate and intentional disobedience of order dated 30.07.2024 passed by Division Bench of this Court in CWP-2066-2018, whereby, the following directions were issued:-

“8. In view of the above, it would be appropriate to dispose of the present petition with the following directions:-

- i) State of Punjab is directed to ensure that whenever a complaint is made which reflects commission of cognizable offence, an FIR ought to be registered in terms of the law laid down by the Apex Court in *Lalita Kumari's case (supra)*.
- ii) The provisions of the Pre-Conception and Pre-Natal Diagnostic Techniques Act, 1994 be followed in its letter and spirit.”

2. Learned counsel for the respondent contends that in compliance of order dated 30.07.2024, affidavit of Mr. Ankur Gupta, IPS, Senior



Superintendent of Police, District Ludhiana (Rural) dated 22.12.2025 has been filed. The same is taken on record. The relevant paras of the affidavit are reproduced as under:-

- “5. That during the course of investigation, the present petitioner Dr. Sumeet Sofat submitted a representation claiming his innocence before the investigating agency. Consequently, an investigation on the said representation was conducted by the SHO, Police Station Sudhar, and the present petitioner Dr. Sumeet Sofat was found innocent and accordingly declared innocent in FIR No. 31 (supra).*
- 6. That after completion of the investigation, the challan was presented before the Ld. Trial Court, except qua the accused namely Sadhu Singh, as he had been declared a proclaimed offender.*
- 7. That thereafter, during the trial, PW-1 complainant Narinder Singh, Retired Assistant Engineer, moved an application under Section 319 Cr.P.C. before the Ld. Trial court, which was allowed vide order dated 29.09.2015 passed by Ld. Trial Court, and the present petitioner Dr. Sumeet Sofat was ordered to be summoned. Consequently, vide order dated 27.01.2016, proceedings qua the present petitioner Dr. Sumeet Sofat were initiated separately vide case No. CHA/48/2016.*
- 8. That thereafter, the Ld. Trial Court vide order dated 30.03.2016 acquitted the other accused named in the FIR, as the prosecution failed to establish the guilt of the accused beyond reasonable doubt as per the charge-sheet.*
- 9. That thereafter, various summons/notice(s) were issued to the present petitioner by the Ld. Trial Court, and vide order dated 16.04.2018, proclamation proceedings*



under Section 82 Cr.P.C. were initiated against him. Ultimately, on 04.10.2018, the Ld. Trial Court declared the present petitioner a proclaimed offender and directed the concerned SHO to register an FIR under Section 174-A IPC against him.

Thus, in view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, FIR No. 247/2018 under Section 174-A IPC, Police Station City Jagraon, was registered against the petitioner after following due procedure of law.

- 10. That thereafter, the petitioner approached this Hon'ble Court by way of CRM-M-25410-2019, CRM-M-25915-2019, CRM-M-25937-2019, and CRM-M-27204-2019 for quashing of FIR No. 31 of 2006 under Section 36 of the Punjab Apartment and Property Regulation Act, 1995 (in short, PAPRA), registered at Police Station Sudhar, Jagraon, the impugned order dated 29.09.2015 (Annexure P-1) passed by the SDJM, Jagraon, the order dated 20.09.2017 (Annexure P-2) passed by the Addl. Sessions Judge, Ludhiana, and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom.*
- 11. That it is pertinent to mention that this Hon'ble Court, vide a common order dated 01.03.2024 passed in the above-mentioned petitions, allowed the said petitions and quashed all proceedings against the present petitioner.*
- 12. That a representation was submitted by the present petitioner. which was endorsed vide No. 373-Email dated 29.01.2025 before the then Senior Superintendent of Police, Ludhiana (Rural), wherein it was alleged that the present petitioner had been declared a proclaimed offender and that a false FIR No. 247 (supra) was registered against him. It was further alleged that the*



petitioner was wrongly summoned as an accused by the Ld. Trial Court under Section 319 Cr.P.C., and that vide order dated 01.03.2024, the proceedings of FIR No. 31 and the PO order were quashed against him by the Hon'ble High Court and thus, action should be taken against the individuals responsible for the forged FIR and the subsequent actions.

Upon receipt of the representation, the same was considered on the basis of the entire record, including documentary/technical evidence. Consequently, Report No. 141-5A/SP (Inv.) dated 01.04.2025 was prepared. In the said report, it was concluded that the order dated 01.03.2024 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court, Chandigarh, cannot become the reason for action especially while keeping in view the ratio of the judgment titled "State of Gujarat vs. Krishna Bai" in Criminal Appeal No. 1485 of 2008 passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. As per the said judgment, only those cases which have been finally disposed of (conviction or acquittal) at the district court level are to be considered. Since the matter involved a decision of the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court Chandigarh, it did not fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee. Accordingly, it was recommended that the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Dakha, correspond with the Director Prosecution and Litigation Department, SAS Nagar (Mohali) and DA(Legal) opinion is to be obtained and take appropriate necessary action, in accordance with law.

- 13. That thereafter, the opinion of DDA(Legal) was obtained, vide Report No. 79/DDA (Legal) dated 09.12.2025. In the said report, it was opined that the co-accused had been acquitted by the Ld Trial Court on the*



basis of benefit of doubt. Further, the Hon'ble Court had allowed the quashing petition of the petitioner on the ground that there were minimal chances of his conviction and that the other accused had already been acquitted by the Ld. Trial Court. Therefore, it was concluded that no police action was required on the representation, it was also recommended that the petitioner may avail himself of an alternative remedy, such as filing a suit for defamation, if he so desires. Thus, in view of the same, no further action was required as the acquittal was due to the benefit of doubt and quashing of Hon'ble High Court and there was no mala fide found on the part of the police or the investigating agency."

3. A perusal of affidavit dated 22.12.2025 shows that order dated 30.07.2024 passed in CWP-2066-2018 has been complied with.
4. In view of the same, the contempt is purged and rule is discharged.
5. All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, are also disposed of.

12.03.2026

P. Seth

(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)**JUDGE**

Whether speaking/non-speaking : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No