

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

CRM No.M-29213 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of Decision: October 09, 2017

Anmol Lakhanpal

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of U.T, Chandigarh and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr.Deepak Sabharwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.G.S.Chahal, Asstt. Public Prosecutor,
for the respondent-U.T. Chandigarh.

Mr.Vinod K. Verma, Advocate
for respondent No.4.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. against State of U.T. Chandigarh and other respondents for issuing directions to official respondents to protect life, liberty and property of the petitioner along with his family members at the hands of private respondent in view of the peculiar facts and circumstances of the present case and to take action on the complaints dated 14.03.2016 and 05.05.2016.

Notice of motion was issued. Learned Asstt. Public Prosecutor for U.T. Chandigarh and learned counsel for respondent No.4 appeared and contested the petition.

Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that FIR should be

registered on the basis of the representations/complaints given to the police by the petitioner on 14.03.2016 and 05.05.2016.

On the other hand, learned counsel for respondent No.4 argued that the petitioner was ex-employee of respondent No.4 and he had stolen cheques and qua that FIR has already been registered against him. Learned counsel for respondent No.4 states that respondent No.4 had gone to house of the petitioner to enquire about the stolen cheques but no occurrence took place as the petitioner did not meet him.

Learned Asstt. Public Prosecutor for U.T. Chandigarh contended that an enquiry has already been conducted and it was found that no such occurrence has taken place.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties as well as learned Asstt. Public Prosecutor for U.T. Chandigarh and have gone through the record.

I have also gone through the representations/complaints given by the petitioner to the police. There are no specific particulars regarding threats to the present petitioner. Only vague allegations have been levelled regarding threat to the life and liberty. The perusal of the representations shows that there is no serious threat to the life and liberty of the petitioner.

As regarding taking action on the representation, as already discussed, the police has enquired into the matter and found that no such occurrence took place. However, the petitioner can avail alternative remedy by filing criminal complaint as held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Sakiri Vasu v. State of U.P. and others, 2008 (1) R.C.R. (Cr.) 392**. It is also held that the petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. should not be entertained in

routine for registration of FIR.

In view of the above discussion, the present petition stands disposed of accordingly.

October 09, 2017
Vgulati

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes
No