



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

**CRA-D-841-2025 (O&M)**

<b>JUDGEMENT RESERVED ON</b>	<b>JUDGEMENT PRONOUNCED ON</b>	<b>OPERATIVE PART PRONOUNCED OR FULL</b>	<b>UPLOADED ON</b>
05.03.2026	16.03.2026	FULL PRONOUNCED	16.03.2026

Ranjit Kaur

...Appellant

Versus

Additional Secretary MHA and Designated Authority,  
National Investigation Agency

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA  
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUKHVINDER KAUR**

Present: Mr. Hitesh Verma, Advocate,  
for the appellant.Mr. S.S. Sandhu, Special Public Prosecutor  
for the respondent-NIA.

\*\*\*\*

**ANOOP CHITKARA, J.**

Criminal Case number before the Sessions Court	CIS No. CRA/110/2024 CNR No.PBSA01003778-2024
Date of Decision	09.05.2025

1. Feeling aggrieved for dismissal of the appeal filed under Section 25 (6) of the (Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967 (for short, UAPA) vide which the impugning order dated 25.08.2023 passed by the Ministry of Home Affairs was upheld by the Sessions Judge, SAS Nagar, NIA, Punjab, the appellant Ranjit Kaur had come up before this court by filing the present second appeal.

2. On 05.03.2026, this Court had heard the matter only because counsel for respondent-NIA had taken a preliminary objection about the maintainability of the present appeal in this Court.



3. Counsel for the respondent-NIA has primarily raised an objection that no second appeal is provided under the law. However, counsel for the appellant submits that a person cannot be left remedy less.

4. Counsel for the respondent-NIA further submits that initially the order was interlocutory and could not have been challenged. However, the said objection should have been taken while opposing the appeal filed by Ranjit Kaur before the Sessions Court. A perusal of order dated 09.05.2025 does not refer to any such opposition regarding the maintainability of the appeal. But be that as it may, the appeal was dismissed.

5. Counsel for the respondent further submits that the matter involves the construction of the house because of the funds obtained through activities permitted under NSA.

6. On the contrary, the appellant's stand is that the house in question was purchased from the salary and before even the said allegations of money were leveled in the FIR.

7. We have heard counsel for the parties and gone through the record and its analysis, which would lead to the following outcome.

8. This Court is not entering into the facts but on the limited question about the maintainability of the second appeal. Needless to say that challenging the order dated 25.08.2023, the present appellant, Ranjeet Kaur, had filed an appeal under Section 25(6) of UAPA. Now feeling aggrieved against its dismissal, the appellant Ranjit Kaur has filed an appeal before this Court again. Needless to say that no second appeal is provided under the law, but it does not mean that the aggrieved party was left remedy less. In such a situation, the remedy before the present appellant was to invoke the revisionary jurisdiction of this Court by filing a criminal revision petition under Section 442 of BNS, which corresponds to Section 401 of CrPC. Thus, present appeal under Section 21 of the National Investigation Agency (NIA) Act, 2008 is not maintainable. Consequently, the present appeal is dismissed with liberty to the appellant to file a criminal revision petition under section 442 of BNSS, if so advised. It is clarified that the time for which the present appeal was pending before this Court shall not be counted for the purpose of



limitation and the limitation to file the revision petition shall start from the day following the date of this judgment.

9. Given above, the present appeal is dismissed in the aforesaid terms. All pending miscellaneous applications, if any, stand disposed of.

**(ANOOP CHITKARA)**  
**JUDGE**

**(SUKHVINDER KAUR)**  
**JUDGE**

16.03.2026  
Jyoti-II

<i>Whether speaking/non-speaking:</i>	<i>Speaking</i>
<i>Whether reportable:</i>	<i>No.</i>