



CWP-11691-2026

-1-

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

139

CWP-11691-2026

Date of Decision: 20.04.2026

Ashok Maggu

...Petitioner

Versus

The Lokayukta, Haryana & others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present: Mr. Nonish Kumar, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Ms. Svaneel Jaswal, Addl. AG, Haryana.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside of order dated 27.01.2026 passed by respondent No.1 – Lokayukta, Haryana. He is also seeking direction to respondent No.2 to take action against the erring official in view of his representation dated 30.06.2025.

2. The petitioner is a public-spirited person. He filed complaint against officials, who along with respondent No.9 are involved in the organised crime of house-grabbing. Respondent No.9 on the assurance of respondent No.5 lodged FIR No.1060 dated 24.12.2018 under Sections 406, 420, 120-B IPC at PS Karnal Civil Lines. He approached this Court by way of CRM-M-17193-2021 seeking quashing of aforesaid FIR, which was allowed vide order dated 14.11.2023. He served representation dated 22.08.2024 pursuant to which the Superintendent of Police, Karnal initiated inquiry against the erring officials. Despite inquiry report dated 21.12.2024 submitted by the DSP, no action has been taken against the erring officials till date. He preferred representation dated 30.06.2025 before Chief Minister to take action against

**CWP-11691-2026****-2-****2026:PHHC:059130**

the erring officials, but to no avail. He preferred application dated 09.10.2025 before learned Lokayukta, which was closed vide order dated 27.01.2026 on the ground that the issue could have been raised before this Court during the proceedings seeking quashing of aforesaid FIR. Learned Lokayukta has further held that sufficient evidence is not available to proceed against DSP and ASI.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the Lokayukta has not appreciated the inquiry report and mechanically closed his complaint.

4. Learned State counsel submits that the matter was thoroughly examined and no official was found guilty of corruption or misuse of power, thus, no action was initiated against them. There is no infirmity in the order of the Lokayukta.

5. Heard the arguments and perused the record.

6. From the perusal of the record, it is evident that at the behest of the petitioner, an inquiry was conducted. The police officials were not found guilty. The allegation of corruption could not be proved. The Lokayukta has examined the matter and closed the complaint. In view of the specific findings of the Inquiry Officer as well as order of Lokayukta, there seems no reason to interfere in exercise of writ jurisdiction of this Court.

7. In the backdrop, the petition stands dismissed. However, it is made clear that on account of filing of complaints and approaching this Court, the respondents/police officials would not harass or create any other unwarranted problem for the petitioner.

20.04.2026

Vimal

**(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE**Whether speaking/reasoned: **Yes/No**Whether reportable: **Yes/No**