



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

114

**CRM-M-11893 of 2026
Date of Decision: 11.05.2026**

R. K. Jain

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present: Petitioner in person.

Mr. Gagandeep Singh Chinna, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the instant petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS, and Articles 14, 19, 21 of the Constitution of India, seeking appropriate penal orders, as also directions to the SHO, PS Civil Lines Jind and Incharge, Summons-Staff Jind, to explain on affidavit regarding alleged non-receipt of Warrants of Arrest (Annexure P-2) in pending CHI 502/2019, FIR No.433/2018, PS Civil Lines Jind dated 07.12.2018.

2. Petitioner appearing in person submitted that he had moved an application under Section 311 CrPC in pending Case No. CHI 502/2019. He further submitted that the learned JMJC illegally cancelled his bail by recording that he had been directed on various dates to supply a copy of the application moved by him to the other party, and consequently, warrants of arrest were issued against him on 27.08.2025. Thereafter, the petitioner filed an RTI application before the Superintendent of Police, Jind, wherein the



reply stated that no warrant of arrest in respect of CHI 502/2019 had ever been received at Police Station Civil Lines, Jind, as per the report received from the summons staff, Jind. He contended that the alleged report of the summons staff had not been supplied to him. Further, an attested copy of the RTI reply was also not supplied to him. Hence, the petitioner prayed for issuance of directions to the respondents to explain the alleged non-receipt of the warrants of arrest in pending Case No. CHI 502/2019, as stated in the RTI reply.

3. Learned counsel for the State submitted that the present petition is misconceived, as the appropriate remedy available to the petitioner is to file an appeal under the RTI Act and not approach this Court, if he is aggrieved by any reply furnished under the RTI Act. He further submitted that the petitioner had neither approached the respondent-State by way of any representation nor annexed any such representation with the petition, despite alleging grievance. Hence, he prayed that the present petition be dismissed.

4. After hearing the petitioner appearing in person, learned counsel for the State, and upon perusal of the record, this Court is of the considered view that the present petition is devoid of merit and is liable to be dismissed. The grievance raised by the petitioner essentially pertains to the reply furnished under the RTI Act regarding alleged non-receipt of warrants of arrest in Case No. CHI 502/2019. If the petitioner was dissatisfied with the information supplied or alleged non-supply of documents sought under the RTI Act, the statute itself provides an efficacious alternative remedy by way of appeal before the competent appellate authority under the provisions of the RTI Act. Moreover, no material has been placed on record to show



that the petitioner approached the competent authorities by way of any representation regarding the alleged grievance before invoking the extraordinary jurisdiction of this Court. The present petition appears to have been filed without exhausting the statutory remedies available to the petitioner and without laying any factual foundation warranting interference by this Court.

5. Accordingly, finding no ground to exercise jurisdiction in the matter, the present petition is dismissed.

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

11.05.2026

D.Bansal

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No