

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

**CRM No.M-43773 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of Decision: December 07, 2016**

Jagtar Singh

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr.Kushagra Mahajan, 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 directing official respondents No.1 and 2 to protect life and liberty of the petitioner and his family, which is under threat at the hands of respondents No.6 to 13.

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

At the time of arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner mainly argued on one point that investigation of the representation dated 04.11.2016 moved by the petitioner should be conducted fairly and impartially and he did not press other relief sought in the petition.

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

Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that investigation is not being conducted fairly and properly. As regarding this grievance that

investigation is not being conducted fairly and properly, the petitioner has

the remedy to approach Illaqa Magistrate, who has ample powers to supervise and even 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 dismissed with liberty to the petitioner to approach the Magistrate to avail alternative remedies.

December 07, 2016
Vgulati

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes
No