



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

**CRM-M-49624 of 2025(O&M)  
Date of Order: 08.09.2025**

**Reena Kumari**

**...Petitioner**

**Versus**

**State of Haryana and others**

**...Respondents**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL**

**Present: Mr. Bhisham Kumar Majoka Advocate  
for the petitioner.**

**Mr. Vikas Bhardwaj, AAG, Haryana**

**SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL, JUDGE**

1. The petition under Article 528 of Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, has been filed, seeking the following directions to the official respondents:-

- (i) To conduct detailed/fair enquiry on complaint dated 29.07.2025, of the petitioner;
- (ii) To transfer the investigation to some other higher officer;
- (iii) To file detailed report regarding the enquiry conducted on complaint of petitioner;
- (iv) To protect the life and liberty of the petitioner and her family members.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in the year, 2016, 100 square yard plot at Vatika Kunj, Bhondsi, was jointly purchased



by petitioner's husband and respondent no.5-Dr. Suman Yadav. With permission of respondent no.5, petitioner's husband started building house on the entire 100 square yard plot. Later, Dr. Suman Yadav agreed to sell the plot to petitioner's husband. He further submitted that the petitioner's husband worked as a Cook in the house of respondent no.5, on payment of salary of Rs.18,000/-. After the settlement, respondent no.5 stopped paying him salary and started adjusting the salary towards payment of the plot. Later, she became dishonest and asked petitioner's husband to leave. Now respondent no.5 was harassing the petitioner by levelling false accusation. She locked the entire house and had threatened them to vacate the house. In this regard, a complaint was lodged with the police but no action was being taken. He further argued that on 24.07.2025, at about 10:00 pm, respondents no.5 to 11 along with 4-5 unknown criminals entered the house of petitioner, assaulted her, removed her gold chain, silver anklet and hit her. The matter was reported to the police but no action was taken. Petitioner also approached respondent no.2 but to no avail.

3. Notice of motion to official respondents only.

4. Learned State counsel has stated that there was a property dispute between the petitioner and private respondents and no directions as sought were required to be given.

4. Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in *Sakiri Vasu vs. State of U.P. and others, (2008) 2 SCC 409*, and *Sudhir Bhaskarrao Tambe v. Hemant Yashwant Dhage and others, (2016) 6 SCC 277*, has observed that the High Courts are flooded with writ petitions praying for registration of the first information report or praying for proper investigation and that if the



High Courts entertain such writ petitions, they will be flooded and may not be able to do any other work except dealing with such writ petitions. Therefore, the complainant must avail of his alternate remedy to approach the Magistrate concerned under Section 156(3) Cr.P.C and if he does so, the Magistrate will ensure, if prima facie he is satisfied, registration of the first information report and also ensure a proper investigation in the matter, and he can also monitor the investigation.

5. Therefore, the petitioner is at liberty to approach the jurisdictional Magistrate for registration of First Information Report on his complaint dated 29.07.2025 and proper investigation in the matter. However, since the petitioner also apprehends threat to her life and liberty from private respondents, respondent no.2 is directed to look into this aspect of the matter and pass appropriate orders, in case threat is perceived, within a period of one month from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

6. Petition stands disposed of.

7. All the miscellaneous applications, if any, stand disposed of.

08.09.2025

nt

(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)

JUDGE

**Whether speaking/reasoned**

**:YES/NO**

**Whether reportable**

**:YES/NO**