

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPCR No. 809 of 2021**

- Dayaram Singh S/o, Narbad Singh Gond, Aged About 34 Years R/o Village Devdand, Khadgava, District Koriya, Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State of Chhattisgarh Through Inspector General Of Police, Surguja Range, District Koriya Chhattisgarh.
2. The Superintendant Of Police Baikunthpur, District Koriya Chhattisgarh.
3. The City Superintendant Of Police Baikunthpur, District Koriya Chhattisgarh.
4. The S.H.O., P.S. Khadgawan, District Koriya Chhattisgarh.
5. Sukhlal S/o Rambhole Aged About 40 Years R/o Village Devdand, Khadgava, District Koriya Chhattisgarh.
6. Kadam Kanwar W/o Sukhlal Aged About 35 Years Village Devdand, Khadgava, District Koriya Chhattisgarh.
7. Ramesh Bhagat S/o Shankar Ram Aged About 40 Years R/o Village Devdand, Khadgava, District Koriya Chhattisgarh.
8. Rajlal S/o Ram Bharose Aged About 45 Years R/o Village Devdand, Khadgava, District Koriya Chhattisgarh.
9. Mainprasad S/o Namalum Aged About 42 Years R/o Village Devdand, Kkadgava, District Koriya Chhattisgarh.
10. Rambhole, S/o Jaljeet, Aged About 56 Years R/o Village Devdand Khadgava, District Koriya Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. M.P.S. Bhatia, Adv.
For State	:	Mr. Ghanshyam Patel, G.A.

Hon'ble Smt Justice Rajani Dubey**Order on Board****07.12.2021**

1. Heard.
2. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner being aggrieved by the inaction of the police authorities whereby despite complaint made by the petitioner against respondents

No. 5 to 10, the police authorities are not investigating this matter with fair manner.

3. On the basis of this factual matrix, the petitioner has filed this petition and prayed for following reliefs:-

10.1. That this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents No. 1 to 4 to take proper action as per law on the complaint made by the petitioner and his aunt Smt. Mangali Bai and register offence under proper sections of law.

10.2. That the Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to direct the respondents No. 1 to 4 to provide protection to the petitioner and his aunt Smt. Mangali Bai, in the ends of justice.

4. Learned State counsel opposed the prayer made through this petition.
5. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in case of **Sakiri Vasu Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh & Others** reported in **(2008) 2 SCC 409**, 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 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.”

6. 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.”

7. From analysis of the 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 deemed 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 whether the averments made in the petition discloses any criminal offence or not, it is for the concerning Magistrate to decide the case on merits of the case without being influenced by any of the observations made by this Court.
8. Considering the facts and materials on record and in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, this Court is of the view that this writ petition is not maintainable.
9. With the aforesaid observations, this petition is finally disposed of with the aforesaid liberty in favour of the petitioner.

Sd/-
(Rajani Dubey)
Judge