

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH****CRM No.M-16686 of 2016(O&M)****Date of Decision: May 13, 2016**

Jagtar Singh

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH**

Present: Mr.Gaurav Chopra, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

\*\*\*\*

**INDERJIT SINGH, J.**

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. against State of Punjab and other respondents for issuance of directions to the officials respondents to transfer the investigation of case FIR No.0059 dated 23.03.2016 under Sections 379, 447 and 511 IPC registered at Police Station Dakha, District Ludhiana Rural to any adjoining district or to any competent official similar to the rank of Senior Superintendent of Police.

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

At the time of arguments, no reasonable ground has been given for transferring the investigation of this case to the adjoining district or to the police official of the rank of SSP. The offence under

Sections 379, 447 and 511 IPC are not of serious nature. There is no allegation that any police official is involved in the commission of offence nor there is any allegation that any senior police official is interested in this case. The FIR is dated 23.03.2016. No ground is made out for transfer of the case after hearing learned counsel for the petitioner. If the petitioner is aggrieved that the investigation is not being conducted fairly and properly, then he can avail the remedy before the Illaqa Magistrate. The Magistrate has ample powers under Section 156 Cr.P.C. to supervise the investigation and even to monitor the investigation. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Sakiri Vasu v. State of U.P. and others, 2008 (1) R.C.R. (Cr.) 392** has held that the petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. should not be entertained in routine and it is held as under:-

*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 above 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 the petitioner has alternative remedies as stated in the above-said case, especially to approach the Judicial Magistrate, therefore, this petition cannot be entertained and the same is disposed of with liberty to the petitioner to approach the Magistrate to avail alternative remedies.

**May 13, 2016**  
Vgulati

**(INDERJIT SINGH)**  
**JUDGE**