

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Writ Jurisdiction Case No.87 of 2014

=====

1. Sheela Devi W/O Pramod Ram Resident Of Village- Piyar, P.S- Piyar,
Distt- Muzaffarpur.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar Through The Director General Of Police, Bihar.
2. The Comissioner, Tirhut Range, Muzaffarpur.
3. The Inspector General Of Police, Trihut Range, Muzaffarpur.
4. The Deputy Inspector Of Police, Tirhut Range, Muzaffarpur.
5. The District Magistrate, Muzaffarpur.
6. The Senior Superintendent Of Police, Muzaffarpur.
7. The Superintendent Of Police, Muzaffarpur. Null Null
8. The Deputy Superintendent Of Police, East Muzaffarpur.
9. The Inspector Of Police, Muzaffarpur.
10. Manj Singh, The Senior Head Office, P.S- Piyar, Muzaffarpur.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Anish Kumar

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Devendra Kr Sinha

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHWANI KUMAR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

2 15-01-2015

The petitioner has made the following prayers in

paragraph 1 of the writ petition filed under Articles 226 and 227

of the Constitution of India :-

“1. That the writ application is being filed issuance the writ in the nature of Mandamus/ Certiorari for giving direction to the respondent authorities to enquire about the matter that the respondent no.10 namely Manju Singh who is presently posted as the Senior head officer of Piyar police station has/ had exceeded her jurisdiction and misutilized her power and collusion with her 8 to 10 police constables and with malice and ulterior motive has demolished the residential house of the petitioner who is the schedule caste lady and abused to the petitioner with caste name.

And

For further direction to the respondents after the

enquiry if it will be found true then suspend the respondent no.10 and other culprits and lodged the FIR against the culprits and initiate the departmental proceedings against the culprits.”

The application is thoroughly misconceived. In case, respondent no.10 or any other person had committed any cognizable offence, it was for the petitioner to take appropriate steps in accordance with law. The petitioner has also other equally efficacious and alternative remedy.

In that view of the matter, I am not inclined to entertain the present application. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed.

(Ashwani Kumar Singh, J)

Pradeep/-

U		T	
---	--	---	--