



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

**CWP No. 34091-2025(O&M)
Date of Decision: 27.03.2026**

Gurjit Singh

....Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present: Mr. Sanjeev Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner

Mr. Aman Dhir, DAG, Punjab

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 take action on his complaints.

2. As per petitioner, he has filed a spate of complaints but no action has been taken. There is property dispute between petitioner and one lady namely Savinder Kaur. As per petitioner, his father mortgaged 2 Kanal land to Savinder Kaur. The said mortgage was subsequently cancelled and his father started cultivating the land. Savinder Kaur wanted to grab said land. On petitioner's father's request, demarcation of land took place and petitioner's father started cultivating the land. The matter came up before Dasuya Court which dismissed Savinder Kaur's case for restoration of possession. Girdawar Balwar Singh started digging a borewell on the



subjected land. The petitioner made complaints and representations to higher authorities including Vigilance Bureau. The Joint Director, Vigilance Bureau, Punjab asked Director General of Police to take action on petitioner's complaint. Respondent No.3-DSP, Dasuya inquired the matter. The petitioner submitted before DSP that inquiry be conducted by Vigilance Department. Getting no response, he preferred *CWP No.10294 of 2024* which was withdrawn with liberty to file a fresh with better particulars. He again filed *CWP No.24513 of 2024* which was withdrawn.

3. Notice of motion.
4. Mr. Aman Dhir, DAG, Punjab, who on advance notice is present in Court, accepts notice.
5. With the consent of both sides, the petition is taken up for final disposal.
6. As per reply dated 03.03.2026, the petitioner has refused to participate in the inquiry to be conducted by DSP. He wants inquiry by Vigilance Bureau.
7. From the perusal of record, it is evident that it is a pure civil dispute between petitioner and Savinder Kaur. The jurisdictional police authorities have expressed their helplessness to inquire the matter because petitioner claims that matter should be enquired only by Vigilance Bureau.
8. This Court while exercising writ jurisdiction cannot appoint one particular agency especially when jurisdictional police authorities are ready to enquire the matter and it is a purely civil dispute.
9. Disposed of. The Court is sanguine that if matter is pending before Vigilance Bureau, it would proceed in accordance with law.



10. Needless to mention that this Court has not expressed any opinion on merits of the case.

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

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

27.03.2026
paramjit

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes	
Whether reportable:		No