

113 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-57601-2022
DECIDED ON:9th DECEMBER, 2022

AMARJEET KAUR

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Rajeshwar Singh, Advocate
 for the petitioner.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J

The jurisdiction of this Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C. has been invoked for issuance of directions to official respondents to register FIR against private respondents No.4 to 11 for causing death of Balbir Singh son of Kabal Singh, resident of Village Sarai, Police Station Gardhiwal, District Hoshiarpur, with a further prayer to direct the official respondents to investigate the matter in accordance with law.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the dead body of real brother namely Balbir Singh of the petitioner who was un-clever (*Sidha*) and was owner of land in village Sarai, Tehsil Dasuya, District Hoshiarpur was recovered on 21.05.2022 under suspicious circumstances from village Dhurian near eucalyptus trees. It is asserted that in the year 2015, respondent No.4 incited the daughter of the deceased-Balbir Singh and both ran away and got married. Thereafter, the deceased had disowned them and was not on talking

terms with them due to which they had grudge against the deceased. In the year 2020, respondents No.4 and 5 (son-in-law and daughter respectively of the deceased) had inflicted injuries upon the deceased-Balbir Singh and in that regard FIR was also registered against respondent No.4. The said FIR was quashed on the basis of compromise.

It is further asserted that respondents No.4 and 5 had started harassing the deceased-Balbir Singh and forcing him to sell the land as they are in need of money. Under the threat extended by respondents No.4 and 5, the deceased-Balbir Singh transferred his land measuring 7 kanals 12 marlas 3 sarsai in favour of respondent No.5. Thereafter on 25.05.2022, respondent No.4 with the help of his brother and friends and respondent No.5 have eliminated the deceased-Balbir Singh. On receipt of information, the petitioner reached the spot and found that the dead body of Balbir Singh was lying at the above place. It is alleged that Balbir Singh has been murdered by respondents No.4 and 5 alongwith their associates.

The petitioner, instead of availing alternative legal remedies under law is before this Court for issuance of directions to the official respondents.

The Supreme Court has dealt with similar issue in following judgments:-

In ***Sakiri Vasu Versus State of U.P. and others, (2008) 2 SCC 409***, held as under:-

“25. 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 Criminal Procedure Code 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 Criminal Procedure Code before the concerned police officers, and if that is of no avail, by approaching the concerned Magistrate under Section 156(3).

26. 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) Criminal Procedure Code or other police officer referred to in Section 36 Criminal Procedure Code. 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) Criminal Procedure Code instead of rushing to the High Court by way of a writ petition or a petition under Section 482 Criminal Procedure Code. Moreover he has a further remedy of filing a criminal complaint under Section 200 Criminal Procedure Code. Why then should writ petitions or Section 482 petitions be entertained when there are so many alternative remedies ?

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 Criminal Procedure Code 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 Sections 36 and 154(3) before the concerned police officers, and if that is of no avail, under Section 156(3) Criminal Procedure Code before the Magistrate or by filing a criminal complaint under Section 200 Criminal Procedure Code and not by filing a writ petition or a petition under Section 482 Criminal Procedure Code.”

In *M. Subramaniam and another Versus S. Janaki and another*,
(2020) 2 R.C.R. (Criminal) 788, held as under:-

5. (11 to 14) XX XX XX

“15. Section 156(3) provides for a check by the Magistrate on the police performing its duties under Chapter XII CrPC. In cases where the Magistrate finds that the police has not done its duty of investigating the case at all, or has not done it satisfactorily, he can issue a direction to the police to do the investigation properly, and can monitor the same.

16. The power in the Magistrate to order further investigation under Section 156(3) is an independent power and does not affect the power of the investigating officer to further investigate the case even after submission of his report vide Section 173(8). Hence the Magistrate can order reopening of the investigation even after the police submits the final report, vide **State of Bihar v. J.A.C. Saldanha (SCC : AIR para 19)**.

17. In our opinion Section 156(3) CrPC is wide enough to include all such powers in a Magistrate which are necessary for ensuring a proper investigation, and it includes the power to order registration of an FIR and of ordering a proper investigation if the Magistrate is satisfied that a proper investigation has not been done, or is not being done by the police. Section 156(3) CrPC, though briefly worded, in our opinion, is very wide and it will include all such incidental powers as are necessary for ensuring a proper investigation.

18. It is well settled that when a power is given to an authority to do something it includes such incidental or implied powers which would ensure the proper doing of that thing. In other words, when any power is expressly granted by the statute, there is impliedly included in the grant, even without special mention, every power and every control the denial of which would render the grant itself ineffective. Thus where an Act confers jurisdiction it impliedly also grants the power of doing all such acts or employ such means as are essentially necessary for its execution.”

Under the Code of Criminal Procedure not only the remedies but complete mechanism has been provided, however, the petitioner has directly approached this Court without exhausting her alternative remedies available to her. Though the alternative remedy is not an absolute bar but no case is made out for carving out an exception in the present case to interfere under Section 482 of Cr.P.C.

In view of discussions made hereinabove, the present petition is dismissed being devoid of any merit.

9th DECEMBER, 2022
sham

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>