

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

CRM-M-30068 of 2019.

Decided on:- July 17, 2019.

Priyanka Rani.

.....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents.

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

\*\*\*\*\*

Present:- Mr. Barjinder Singh, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

**HARI PAL VERMA, J. (Oral)**

Prayer in this petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is for issuance of directions to the official respondents No.2 and 3 to take necessary action against private respondents No.4 to 11 in pursuance of the order dated 11.06.2019 passed by this Court in ***CWP No.16559 of 2019*** titled as ***Priyanka Rani and another Versus State of Punjab and others.***

Learned counsel for the petitioners states that the petitioner had solemnized marriage with respondent No.4 on 11.06.2019. However, after marriage, the private respondents No.5 to 11 started harassing the petitioner on account of dowry demands and the petitioner was badly treated and beaten by all the private respondents. Thereafter, the petitioner approached respondent No.3 and requested to provide police protection to her and take necessary legal action, but no action was taken.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner.

Virtually, the prayer made in this petition is for issuance of a direction to register the case against the private respondents. This Court finds that the petitioner has the remedy to avail.

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*.

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 private respondents No.4 to 11. However, 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.

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

**July 17, 2019**  
Yag Dutt

**(HARI PAL VERMA)**  
**JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes

Whether Reportable: No