

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPCR No. 783 of 2021**

- Govind Ram, S/o Late Ratan Ram, Aged About 52 Years, Cast Uraon, President of Municipal Council Balrampur R/o Ward No. 2 Main Road Balrampur District Balrampur Ramanujganj Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary Department of Home Mahanadi Bhawan Atalnagar New Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
2. Inspector General of Police Surguja Range Ambikapjur, District Surguja Chhattisgarh.
3. Superintendent of Police Balrampur, District Balrampur Ramanujganj Chhattisgarh.
4. The Station House Officer Police Station Balrampur, District Balrampur Ramanujganj Chhattisgarh.
5. Sumit Gupta Chief Municipal Officer Municipal Council Balrampur District Balrampur Ramanujganj Chhattisgarh.
6. Subhankur Pandey Journlist of Surguja Samay Head Office Lok Nayak Jai Prakash Ward No. 29 Myapur Ambikapur District Surguja Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondents

For Petitioner : Mr. A.N. Pandey, Advocate
For State/respondents : Ms. Smita Jha, P.L.

Hon'ble Smt. Justice Rajani Dubey**Order on Board****30.11.2021**

1. Factual matrix of the case is that the petitioner belongs to Uraon Caste under the Scheduled Tribe and he is an elected president of Municipal Council Balrampur, Balrampur and on 21.09.2021, when he demanded the file of incoming and outgoing register, respondents No. 5 & 6 started abusing the petitioner in filthy language in the name of caste. Hence, this petition has been filed to direct the police authorities to register FIR against respondents No. 5 and 6 in the interest of justice.
2. On the basis of this factual matrix, the petitioner has filed this petition and prayed for following reliefs:-
 - a. The Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to direct the police authorities to register the FIR against the respondents No. 5 & 6 on the basis of complaint lodged by the petitioner dated 21.09.2021.
 - b. The Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to grant any other relief as the Hon'ble Court may be deemed fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case.
3. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in case of **Sakiri Vasu Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh & others 1**, has examined the issue in paragraphs 27 and 28 and held as under:-

"27. As we have already observed above, the Magistrate has very wide powers to direct registration of an FIR and to ensure a proper investigation, and for this purpose he can monitor the investigation to ensure that the investigation is done properly (though he cannot investigate himself). The High Court should discourage the practice of filing a writ petition or

petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. simply because a person has a grievance that his FIR has not been registered by the police, or after being registered, proper investigation has not been done by the police. For this grievance, the remedy lies under Section 36 and 154 (3) before the concerned police officers, and if that is of no avail, under Section 156 (3) Cr.P.C. before the Magistrate or by filing a criminal complaint under Section 200 Cr.P.C. and not by filing a writ petition or a petition under Section Cr.P.C.

"28. It is true that alternative remedy is not an absolute bar to a writ petition, but it is equally well settled that if there is an alternative remedy the High Court should not ordinarily interfere."

4. The judgment passed by Hon'ble the Supreme Court in Sakiri Vasu (Supra) has again come up for consideration before three judges (2008) 2 SCC 409 Bench in case of **M. Subramaniam & another Vs. S. Janaki & another 2**. The Supreme Court after considering the same judgment has held at para 7 & 9 which are as under:-

"7. The said ratio has been followed in Sudhir Bhaskarrao Tambe v. Hemant Yashwant Dhage, in which it is observed: (SCC p. 278, paras 2-4) "2. This Court has held in Sakiri Vasu V. State of U.P., that if a person has a grievance that his FIR has not been registered by the police, or having been registered, proper investigation is not being done, then the remedy of the aggrieved person is not to go to the High Court under Article_226 of the Constitution of India, but to approach the Magistrate concerned under Section 156 (3) CrPC. If such an application under Section 156 (3) CrPC is made and the Magistrate is, prima facie, satisfied, he can direct the FIR to be registered, or if it has already been registered, he can direct proper investigation to be

done which includes in his discretion, if he deems it necessary, recommending change of the investigating officer, so that a proper investigation is done in the matter. We have said this in Sakiri Vasu case because what we have found in this country is that the High Courts have been flooded with writ petitions praying for registration of the first information report or praying for a proper investigation.”

“9. We are of the opinion that if the High Courts entertain such writ petitions, then they will be flooded with such writ petitions and will not be able to do any other work except dealing with such writ petitions. Hence, we have held that the complainant must avail of his alternate remedy to approach the Magistrate concerned under Section 156 (3) CrPC and if he does so, the Magistrate will ensure, if prima facie he is satisfied, registration of the first information report and also ensure a proper investigation in the matter, and he can also monitor the investigation.”

5. From the analysis of above legal provisions, it is crystal clear that the writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India is not maintainable before the High Court. However, it is open to the petitioner to approach the court of Judicial Magistrate First Class having territorial jurisdiction over the place of offence if it deems appropriate and necessary for filing of complaint under Section 156(3) of Cr.P.C or Section 200 of Cr.P.C. and in-turn Magistrate will follow the procedure prescribed under the provisions of the Cr.P.C. It is made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion on merits of the case as to whether the averments made in the petition discloses any criminal offence or not, it is for the concerned Magistrate to decide the case on merits of the case without being influenced by any of the observations made by this Court.

6. Considering the facts and materials available on record and in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, this Court is of the view that the present writ petition is not maintainable.
7. With the aforesaid observation, the writ petition (criminal) is disposed of with the aforesaid liberty in favour of the petitioner.

**Sd/-
(Rajani Dubey)
Judge**

Ruchi/-