



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

**CRM-M-25657-2025
DECIDED ON: 12.05.2025**

SMITA KHURANA AND OTHERSPETITIONER(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERSRESPONDENT(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Anurag Ojha, Advocate
for the petitioner. (through Hybrid Mode)

Mr. Chetan Sharma, DAG, Haryana.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

This petition has been filed under Section 528 of the BNSS, 2023 seeking directions against the respondent for not harassing them.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioners have received notice dated 08.03.2025 (Annexure P-2) from the Investigating officer in a complaint alleging commissioning of offence under Sections 420, 406, 120B, 468, 471, 477A of IPC, 1860 submitted by the complainant-Dinesh Gupta, to which the petitioners duly filed reply dated 10.03.2025 (Annexures P-3 and P-4) stating that the allegations made in the complaint are legally untenable and the authority to investigate the nature of

allegations rests with Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI) and Bombay Stock Exchange (BSE) and not the official respondents i.e. the State Police.

Learned State Counsel appearing on advance notice submits that after 10.03.2025, no notice was issued to the petitioners but they have been called upon only to furnish the relevant documents so that the complaint submitted by Dinesh Gupta can be dealt with and enquired into.

Be that as it may, learned counsel for the petitioner undertakes that the petitioners will contact the office of Investigating officer with the relevant documents within one week from today in light of the notice dated 08.03.2025 i.e. Annexure P-2.

It is further clarified that no coercive steps will be taken against the present petitioners including their arrest.

In view of the above, the instant petition is disposed of in aforesaid terms.

12.05.2025
anuradha

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No