

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.53743 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-79 Year-2022 Thana- SHASTRINAGAR District- Patna

MRITYUNJAY MOHAN Son of Late Dr. Dhruva Narayan Pandey Resident of Village - Shitalpur Kothi, Shitalpur Rail Staton , Akbarpur, P.s.- Dariyapur, Distt.- Sharan, Bihar, Present residing at 105, Raj Apartment, Ashianagar, P.S.- Shastrinagar, Distt.- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Bihar
2. Senior Superintendent of Police, Patna. Bihar
3. Thana Incharge, P.S. Shastrinagar, Patna. Bihar
4. Investigating Officer of Shastrinagar, P.S. Case no.79/2022 Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Shama Sinha
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Md. Aslam Ansari

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 22-06-2023 Heard learned counsel for petitioner and learned Additional Public Prosecutor.

2. The defect(s) shall be removed by the petitioner within eight weeks.

3. This application is filed for issuing directions to Respondents to conduct fair, proper, and speedy investigation in Shastrinagar P.S. Case No. 79/2022 dated 14.02.2022 registered in compliance with the order dated 12.01.2022 passed by learned Chief Judicial magistrate, Patna under section 156(3) of Cr.P.C.

4. The following direction has been passed in the case



of *Surendra Singh Vs. State of Bihar (2022) 4 PLJR 689:*

This Court is afraid that the manner in which the public faith in the police administration in the matter of conduct of proper and fair investigation is eroding, the very credibility of the investigating agency is at the stake and unless some stringent but well informed measures are immediately taken to bring about a complete change in the conduct of investigation, the manner of investigation and other related matter, it will not be possible to keep the public faith intact and that will be a disastrous situation.

In the aforementioned background of the facts and circumstances, keeping in view the law on the subject, this Court is issuing the following directions:—

(I) In the cases where the investigation of the case is still pending, the concerned writ petitioner/an aggrieved person (hereinafter referred to as the 'writ petitioner' or 'an aggrieved person') may file an appropriate application before the Senior Superintendent of Police/Superintendent of Police of the concerned district drawing his attention towards the pending investigation. The aggrieved person shall submit his stand by way of an application with all supporting materials in the office of Senior Superintendent of Police/Superintendent of Police or send the same through registered post/speed post/email, as the case may be. A copy of the same shall also be sent to the investigating officer of the case.

(II) On receipt of such application from the aggrieved person, the Senior Superintendent of Police/Superintendent of Police shall himself supervise the said case within a period of two weeks, wherever necessary he shall give a chance of hearing to the aggrieved person and all endeavors be made to consider the submissions as well as the materials produced before him.

(III) The Senior Superintendent of Police/Superintendent of Police shall issue necessary instructions to any other supervising authority such as Dy.S.P. and also to the I.Os. of the case to complete the investigation from all angles within a reasonable period. What will be the reasonable period will depend upon the nature of the case and the kind of materials which are required to be dealt with. It is to be kept in mind that only because the Criminal Procedure Code does not provide for maximum limit within which an investigation is to be completed, it does not mean



that the investigation is to be kept pending for decades. There are many judicial pronouncements of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in which the prosecution has been quashed because the investigating agency failed to complete the investigation of the case despite lapse of several years. Undue delay in completion of investigation erodes public faith and confidence in the investigating agency.

(IV) Upon receipt of a request/application/representation from a person connected with the case and aggrieved by and dissatisfied with the investigation alleging improper investigation, complaints of threat to him or his family or the witnesses by his opponents, accused or his associates, it is the Sr. Superintendent of Police/Superintendent of Police of the concerned district and the Station House Officer of the concerned police station as well as the I.O. of the case who would be duty bound to enter or caused to be entered the information in the station diary of the police station and examine or caused to be examined the threat perception of the informant and/or his family members/witnesses and take appropriate steps at the earliest, in the cases where threat perceptions are found to be genuine, they would take immediate measures to protect the life of the person(s) under threat. Delay in examining the request/representation leading to any serious consequences shall in itself be a matter of enquiry and action against the erring police officials.

(V) As regards the grievance that accused persons are not being arrested in cases involving serious and heinous offences the Senior Superintendent of Police/Superintendent of Police/Investigating Officer shall take appropriate steps keeping in view the law and judgments of the Hon'ble Apex Court on the subject. In the matter of absconding accused the I.O. must take immediate steps to arrest him and exhaust all other procedures in accordance with law with utmost expedition.

(VI) This Court has already reproduced the extracts from judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Sakiri Vasu (supra).

In the light of the said judgment, this Court directs that in all these cases the learned Magistrate(s) in whose court the case is pending, shall, without seeking any application from the informant monitor the investigation. They are fully competent to take a view as to whether a proper investigation is taking place or not. Learned Magistrates are expected to exercise their powers under Section 156(3) Cr.P.C.



to ensure that investigation of the case pending before the learned Magistrate is duly investigated. If it is found that the Investigating Officer is not proceeding with the investigation expeditiously and is keeping the same pending without rhyme or reason and in the opinion of the learned Magistrate it is found to be a case of inaction on the part of the Investigating Officer, the learned Magistrate would be well within his powers to direct the Senior Superintendent of Police/Superintendent of Police to change the Investigating Officer, to supervise the case himself by the Senior Superintendent of Police/Superintendent of Police and to take appropriate measures in accordance with law. While exercising his power under Section 156(3) Cr.P.C., the learned Magistrate shall definitely monitor the investigation, though he cannot investigate the case himself and will not act as supervisory authority but it is certainly within his domain to ensure that the investigation is done properly and for this purpose without interfering with the power of the Investigating Officer or the Supervising Authority to conduct an investigation, the learned Magistrate may issue appropriate directions which in his opinion is required for conduct of proper investigation. What would be the nature of such direction(s) in a given case cannot be put in a straight jacket formula and it is for the learned Magistrate to look into this aspect of the matter on case to case basis. An application filed by an aggrieved person with prior service of copy upon the learned Public Prosecutor/A.P.P. seeking directions for proper investigation must be heard expeditiously and the same be disposed of within a period of 30 days from the date on which such application is moved before the learned Magistrate on the first date. If the learned Magistrate fails to exercise his power under Section 156 (3) Cr.P.C. either on his own or on filing of the application by the aggrieved person, an appropriate application may be brought before this Court for an order/direction and monitoring as the case may be. (VII) If any of the directions issued by the learned Magistrate in accordance with the order of this Court as stated above to the Senior Superintendent of Police/Superintendent of Police/investigating officer, unless otherwise interfered with by a competent court of law, is not given effect to by the concerned authorities, it will be taken to be a case of contempt of this Court and the learned Magistrate may inform this Court as regards the willful disobedience or disregard shown to the



order/orders, direction/directions issued by him in terms of this judgment. In such circumstance an aggrieved person may also file an application seeking initiation of contempt.
(VIII) All the stake-holders in the present writ applications shall act accordingly. A copy of this order be sent to the Director General of Police, Bihar to enable him to issue necessary instructions at the earliest.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the Magistrate must follow the directions of this Court as extracted above.

6. The prayer of the petitioner seems to be bona-fide. The prayer of the petitioner is to be considered in the light of ***Surendra Singh Vs. State of Bihar(Supra)***. The Magistrate must pass an order within one week of the communication of this order in the Court below. Failure to follow the directions which is given in ***Surendra Singh Vs. State of Bihar(Supra)*** shall result in the initiation of contempt proceeding against the Magistrate.

7. In view of the above, this application is disposed of.

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

Sunnykr/-

U		T	
---	--	---	--

