



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

CRM-M-21429 of 2025

Date of decision: 24.04.2025

Jyoti @ Bhawna Bajaj and another

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAMIT KUMAR

Present: - Mr. Amandeep Singh Manaise, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. Adhiraj Singh, AAG, Punjab.

NAMIT KUMAR, J. (ORAL)

1. Instant petition has been filed under Section 528 of the BNSS, 2023 seeking direction to respondents No.1 to 3 to prevent undue harassment and false prosecution of the petitioners at the hands of respondent No.4. Further direction has been sought to respondent No.3 to stay any further inquiry on the fresh complaint of respondent No.4 on the same cause of action being violative of order/instructions dated 01.04.2008 of the DGP, Punjab, regarding multiple inquiries.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that initially respondent No.4 filed complaint No.843-Peshgi dated 08.05.2024 to Senior Superintendent of Police, Pathankot. Brother of petitioner No.1 (husband of respondent No.4) also filed a cross-complaint No.865-Peshgi dated 13.05.2024 and both the complaints were clubbed together and were inquired into by the police and were filed vide inquiry report



dated 07.06.2024 (Annexure P-1). Thereafter again complaint No.1016-Peshgi dated 05.06.2024 and complaint No.180-HR dated 06.09.2024 were filed by respondent No.4, which were also inquired into and were filed vide inquiry reports dated 29.07.2024 (Annexure P-2) and 14.09.2024 (Annexure P-3), respectively. Thereafter again complaint dated 28.08.2024 was filed by respondent No.4 to the Punjab State Women Commission, Mohali, and was marked to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Pathankot, and vide inquiry report dated 16.09.2024 same was filed by observing that conducting repeated inquiries in the same matter is not appropriate. He submits that yet another complaint No.PGD-346890 dated 24.10.2024 was filed by respondent No.4, which was also inquired into vide inquiry report dated 19.11.2024 (Annexure P-4) and was found to be not maintainable. Learned counsel submits that since the petitioners have been and are being harassed by respondent No.4 by filing multiple complaints on the same allegations, therefore, the petitioners have submitted representation dated 05.04.2025 (Annexure P-7) to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Pathankot, which is still pending consideration. He submits that the petitioner would be satisfied if time-bound directions are issued to respondent No.3-Senior Superintendent of Police, Pathankot, to consider and dispose of the said representation.

3. Notice of motion to respondents No.1 to 3 only at this stage.



4. Mr. Adhiraj Singh, AAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents No.1 to 3-State and has no objection to the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioners.

5. Without commenting upon the merits of the claim of the petitioners and even the assertions set out in the petition, the same is disposed of only with a direction to respondent No.3 – Senior Superintendent of Police, Pathankot, that if any such representation, as indicated above, is indeed pending consideration, that shall be dealt with expeditiously in accordance with law by passing a speaking order preferably within a period of one month from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order and convey the same to the petitioners.

6. The present petition stands disposed of accordingly.

24.04.2025
R.S.

(NAMIT KUMAR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether Reportable : Yes/No