

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

.....

Criminal Misc. No.M-16116 of 2014

.....

Date of decision:19.11.2015

Amrik Singh

...Petitioner

v.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

.....

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Inderjit Singh

.....

Present: Mr. Atul Goyal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Simsi Dhir Malhotra, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondent-State.

Mr. Amit Aggarwal, Advocate for respondent No.6.

.....

Inderjit Singh, J.

The petitioner has filed this petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. praying for issuance of directions to respondents No.3 to 5 to forthwith initiate appropriate criminal proceedings against respondent No.6 for the offence of cheating, forgery, breach of trust, criminal intimidation as well as other cognizable offences. It has further been prayed for issuance of directions to respondents No.1 to 3 to mark the enquiry in the above said matter before any other officer other than ADCP-IV, Ludhiana, namely, Shri Swapan Sharma. In the alternative it has been prayed to direct respondent No.3 himself to take appropriate action upon the representation dated

8.4.2014 (Annexure-P.8) sent by the petitioner.

Notice of motion has been issued in this case. Ms. Simsi Dhir Malhotra, learned Deputy Advocate General, Punjab has put in appearance on behalf of respondents No.1 to 5 and Mr. Amit Aggarwal, learned Advocate has appeared on behalf of Ranjodh Singh-respondent No.6 and contested this petition. Replies have also been filed on behalf of the respondents.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record.

From the record, I find that as regards petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for taking necessary action or initiating criminal proceedings, as per the law laid down by Hon'ble Supreme Court in Sakiri Vasu v. State of U.P. and others, 2008 (1) RCR (Cr.) 392 (SC), alternative remedies are available and as held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. should not be entertained in routine manner.

In Sakiri Vasu v. State of U.P. and others (supra), it was observed by the Supreme Court as under:-

“11. In this connection we would like to state that if a person has a grievance that the police station is not registering his FIR under Section 154 Cr.P.C., then he can approach the Superintendent of Police under Section 154(3) Cr.P.C. by an application in writing. Even if that does not yield any satisfactory result in the sense that either the FIR is still not registered, or that even after registering it no proper

investigation is held, it is open to the aggrieved person to file an application under Section 156 (3) Cr.P.C. before the learned Magistrate concerned. If such an application under Section 156 (3) is filed before the Magistrate, the Magistrate can direct the FIR to be registered and also can direct a proper investigation to be made, in a case where, according to the aggrieved person, no proper investigation was made. The Magistrate can also under the same provision monitor the investigation to ensure a proper investigation.

17. In our opinion Section 156(3) Cr.P.C. is wide enough to include all such powers in a Magistrate which are necessary for ensuring a proper investigation, and it includes the power to order registration of an F.I.R. and of ordering a proper investigation if the Magistrate is satisfied that a proper investigation has not been done, or is not being done by the police. Section 156(3) Cr.P.C, though briefly worded, in our opinion, is very wide and it will include all such incidental powers as are necessary for ensuring a proper investigation.

18. It is well-settled that when a power is given to an authority to do something it includes such incidental or implied powers which would ensure the proper doing of that thing. In other words, when any power is expressly granted by the statute, there is impliedly included in the grant, even without special mention, every power and every control the denial of which

would render the grant itself ineffective. Thus where an Act confers jurisdiction it impliedly also grants the power of doing all such acts or employ such means as are essentially necessary to its execution.

25. We have elaborated on the above matter because we often find that when someone has a grievance that his FIR has not been registered at the police station and/or a proper investigation is not being done by the police, he rushes to the High Court to file a writ petition or a petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. We are of the opinion that the High Court should not encourage this practice and should ordinarily refuse to interfere in such matters, and relegate the petitioner to his alternating remedy, firstly under Section 154(3) and Section 36 Cr.P.C. before the concerned police officers, and if that is of no avail, by approaching the concerned Magistrate under Section 156(3).

26. If a person has a grievance that his FIR has not been registered by the police station his first remedy is to approach the Superintendent of Police under Section 154(3) Cr.P.C. or other police officer referred to in Section 36 Cr.P.C. If despite approaching the Superintendent of Police or the officer referred to in Section 36 his grievance still persists, then he can approach a Magistrate under Section 156(3) Cr.P.C. instead of rushing to the High Court by way of a writ petition or a petition

under Section 482 Cr.P.C. Moreover he has a further remedy of filing a criminal complaint under Section 200 Cr.P.C. Why then should writ petitions or Section 482 petitions be entertained when there are so many alternative remedies?

27. As we have already observed above, the Magistrate has very wide powers to direct registration of an FIR and to ensure a proper investigation, and for this purpose he can monitor the investigation to ensure that the investigation is done properly (though he cannot investigate himself). The High Court should discourage the practice of filing a writ petition or petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. simply because a person has a grievance that his FIR has not been registered by the police, or after being registered, proper investigation has not been done by the police. For this grievance, the remedy lies under Sections 36 and 154 (3) before the concerned police officers, and if that is of no avail, under Section 156(3) Cr.P.C. before the Magistrate or by filing a criminal complaint under Section 200 Cr.P.C. and not by filing a writ petition or a petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C.

28. It is true that alternative remedy is not an absolute bar to a writ petition, but it is equally well settled that if there is an alternative remedy the High Court should not ordinarily interfere.”

The law laid down in this judgment has also been relied upon by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in T.C. Thangaraj v. V. Engammal and others, 2011

(3) R.C.R. (Cr.) 751.

As regards the second relief of issuance of directions to respondents No.1 to 3 to mark the enquiry in the above said matter before any other officer other than ADCP-IV, Ludhiana, namely, Shri Swapan Sharma, the enquiry has already been marked to Mr. Narender Bhargava, DCP, Ludhiana as stated. As the matter is already pending for enquiry before Shri Narender Bhargava, DCP, Ludhiana, therefore, no further action is required in this case.

Therefore, in view of the above observations, the petition is disposed of.

November 19, 2015.

(Inderjit Singh)
Judge

hsp