

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

CRM-M-49981 of 2019.

Decided on:- November 25, 2019.

Guramrit Kaur.

.....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents.

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

Present:- Mr. Ashish Soi, 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 to decide the representations Annexure P-3 and P-4 made by the petitioner in a proper, fair, transparent and unbiased manner and to protect the life and liberty of the petitioner and her family.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the marriage of petitioner was solemnized with Rupinderpreet Singh on 23.03.2011. The father of the petitioner gave all the dowry articles as demanded by her in-laws, but after the marriage, the husband and in-laws of the petitioner started harassing her for demand of dowry. She has been repeatedly beaten, harassed and subjected to cruelty on multiple occasions. The petitioner has approached the police authorities several times and has made representation dated 26.09.2019 (Annexure P-3) to respondent No.3-

Commissioner of Police, Ludhiana as well as another representation dated 07.11.2019 (Annexure P-4) to Police Official (ACP), Police Station Division No.7, Ludhiana, but no action is being taken by the police against the husband and in-laws of the petitioner. The husband of the petitioner is a government doctor and is arm-twisting the opinion of the police department by using his political connections to influence the pending inquiries.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner.

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.

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

November 25, 2019
Yag Dutt

(HARI PAL VERMA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes
Whether Reportable:	No