

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

CRM-M-7911 of 2018.

Decided on:- December 16, 2019.

Baljit Kaur.

.....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondents.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA.

Present:- None for the petitioner.

Mr. Saurav Khurana, DAG, Punjab.

HARI PAL VERMA, J. (Oral)

Prayer in this petition filed under Section 482/483 Cr.P.C. read with Article 227 of the Constitution of India is for passing of appropriate order to meet the ends of justice with a specific prayer for calling the action taken report from the respondents in pursuance of the order dated 14.11.2017 (Annexure P-5) passed by learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Amritsar.

There is no representation on behalf of the petitioner. Vide order dated 23.02.2018 passed by this Court, the petitioner was directed to place on record the medico-legal report (MLR) regarding the injuries suffered at the hands of her husband and his family. But despite having been granted 5 opportunities, no such copy of the MLR has been placed on record and adjournments were being sought repeatedly.

Moreover, in the present case, the virtual prayer of the petitioner is nothing but to seek issuance of a direction for registration of the FIR

against the husband and in-laws of the petitioner for which a separate remedy is available to the petitioner.

Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Sakiri Vasu Versus State of U.P. and others (2008) 2 SCC 409*** has held as under:

“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).

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?”

Similar view has also been taken by Hon'ble Madras High Court in ***Sugesan Transport Private Limited Versus The Assistant Commissioner***

of Police 2016(5) CTC 577 and K. Raghupathy Versus The Commissioner of Police, Greater Chennai, Vepery, Chennai and another 2017 (3) MLJ (Criminal) 449.

Thus in view of the aforesaid observations made by Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Sakiri Vasu's case (supra)***, ***Sujesan Transport Private Limited's case (supra)*** and ***K. Raghupathy's case (supra)***, it is apparent that no such direction can be issued by this Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C. as the efficacious remedy is already available to the petitioner for the relief claimed in this petition. The petitioner, if so advised, may avail the appropriate remedy.

In view of the above, the present petition stands dismissed.

December 16, 2019
Yag Dutt

(HARI PAL VERMA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes
Whether Reportable:	No