

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

113 CRM-M-11457-2023 (O&M)
Date of Decision : March 13, 2024

HARBANS SINGH SANDHU -PETITIONER

V/S

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS -RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. Vaibhav Sehgal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Pardeep Bajaj, D.A.G., Punjab.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (ORAL)

1. Through the instant petition, as instituted under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C., the petitioner seeks issuance of directions upon the respondents No.2 and 3, to take action on the representation dated 10.12.2022 (Annexure P-10).
2. The learned State counsel has filed reply, on affidavit of Jatinder Pal Singh, PPS, DSP Dakha, District Ludhiana (Rural), which is taken on record.
3. What emanates from the reply (supra), is that, upon an application being made by the petitioner to the S.S.P. concerned, the latter ordered for registration of FIR No.86 dated 03.06.2022, under Sections 420/465/467/468/471/120-B of the IPC, at P.S. Dakha, against Sandeep Singh Sekhon, Paramveer Singh Gill, Sandeep Singh, Hardeep Singh and Harshpreet Singh.
4. The reply (supra) further discloses that, in the FIR (supra), a

Cancellation Report was prepared on 23.11.2022, which was presented before the learned Magistrate concerned on 05.12.2022. Aggrieved by presentation of the Cancellation Report (supra), the instant petition has been filed by the petitioner.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, after filing of the Cancellation Report (supra), the petitioner had moved an application before the learned Magistrate concerned, thereby praying for his being provided the report(s) of multiple inquiries, which were conducted in the FIR (supra). He further submits that, consequent upon his making the application (supra), the petitioner has recently been supplied the copies of the desired reports.

6. In view of what has been discussed above, this Court is of the opinion that, the instant petition is a misconceived motion, inasmuch as, the petitioner is seized of an efficacious alternative remedy for redressal of his grievance. Therefore, since the petitioner has sidetracked the alternative available statutory remedy(ies), this Court refrains from interfering in the matter. However, liberty is reserved to the petitioner to, if his grievance yet survives, recourse the alternative available statutory remedy(ies) before the appropriate authority/forum concerned.

7. Disposed of accordingly.

8. Pending application(s) also stand disposed of accordingly.

March 13, 2024
devinder

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No