

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
CRIMINAL PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION (STAMP) NO. 46 OF 2017

Pramod Mukund Dalvi	..Petitioner
versus	
The State of Maharashtra & Ors.	..Respondents

Mr. S. G. Rajput with Mr. Aditya Jadhav for Petitioner.
Ms P. P. Shinde – APP for State.

**CORAM: S. C. DHARMADHIKARI &
SMT. BHARATI HARISH DANGRE, JJ.**

DATE : 23RD JANUARY, 2018

P. C. :

1] Mr. Rajput on instructions states that the petitioner will attend the Office of the Senior Inspector of Police, Local Crime Branch, Palghar, respondent no. 6 to this petition and have his statement recorded based on which the said respondent no. 6 can then take appropriate action in accordance with law.

2] We expect all those who rush to court and complaining that there is no action taken although cognizable offences punishable under the IPC have been committed, to firstly approach the nearest police station and if that police station does not render any assistance, bring to the notice of the superiors manning such police stations that there is a serious lapse on the part of these officials. If that also does not meet with success then section 190 of the Code of Criminal Procedure affords a complete opportunity to approach and file a private complaint in the competent

criminal court. It is then for the court to take appropriate steps in accordance with law. We find people rushing to this court and expressing total lack of faith in the police machinery but without requisite materials of deliberate inaction, negligence or callousness on their part. Further what the petitioner overlook is that in criminal justice delivery system one must repose faith and trust in the least in a competent criminal court and that minimal faith is not shown by rushing to this court. In the circumstances, when all these steps and remedies are available, we are not obliged to entertain this petition. It is disposed of.

(SMT. BHARATI H. DANGRE, J.)

(S. C. DHARMADHIKARI, J.)

Chandka