



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

121

CRM-M-14396-2025

Date of decision: April 7th, 2025

Vikas Setia

.....Petitioner

Versus

The State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Arun Kumar Vasudeva, Advocate
for the petitioner.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

The petitioner has approached this Court under Section 528 of the BNSS, invoking its inherent jurisdiction.

2. The relief sought is for a direction to respondent No.2 to ensure that a fresh and complete inquiry report is filed by the investigating/Inquiry Officer. The petitioner assails the inquiry report dated 24.07.2024 Annexure P-1, prepared by respondent No.3 as being biased and incomplete in all respects, arising out of the complaint lodged by the petitioner.

3. A further prayer has been made for issuance of a direction to respondent No.2 to refer the matter for inquiry to a senior officer of IPS rank, contending that the existing report lacks any logical conclusion and has merely been kept in abeyance pending the final decision in an appeal before the consumer forum. It is submitted that the petitioner, a motorcycle dealer, has been

wrongly fastened with liability to pay ₹15 lakh by the District Consumer Commission, despite having no role beyond the sale of the vehicle in question to the deceased. It is urged that the alleged deficiencies in the inquiry report have led to unwarranted harassment of the petitioner.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the relevant material on record.

5. It is well settled that the extraordinary jurisdiction under Section 528 of the BNSS is to be exercised sparingly and only in situations where intervention is imperative to secure the ends of justice. The relief sought by the petitioner, essentially seeking substitution of the Inquiry Officer or re-evaluation of the report, is premised on the subjective dissatisfaction of the petitioner with the conclusions drawn in the inquiry. No procedural illegality or material irregularity in the conduct of the inquiry has been demonstrated that would justify invocation of the inherent jurisdiction of this Court.

6. This Court is not an appellate forum over administrative inquiries, nor can it be called upon to direct the investigating agency to adopt a particular course of action in the absence of any glaring illegality or arbitrariness. The fact that the inquiry report awaits further consideration owing to the pendency of a consumer appeal, or that the petitioner is aggrieved by the findings of the consumer commission, does not furnish a valid ground to invoke the inherent jurisdiction of this Court in the

manner sought.

7. Furthermore, the prayer for directing an inquiry by a senior officer of IPS rank is entirely unwarranted and unsupported by any cogent basis.

8. No case for interference is made out. The petition is accordingly dismissed.

April 7th, 2025
Puneet

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No