



112

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-46198-2024 (O&M)
Date of decision: 17.09.2024

Kulveer Kaur

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Pankaj Nanhera, Advocate
for the petitioner.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (for short 'Cr.P.C.') for issuance of directions to respondent No.3 to register an FIR against respondents No.4 to 7 for committing fraud, as respondent No.4 fled away from the country leaving behind the petitioner and her minor daughter and to constitute a Special Investigation Team to investigate the matter.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that marriage of the petitioner was solemnized with respondent No.4 on 24.07.2022

2024:PHHC:122305



and respondents No.4 to 7 harassed her on account of bringing insufficient dowry. Respondent No.4, on the pretext of settling in USA along with the petitioner, took Rs.5.00 lacs from her father. At the time of birth of a female child, respondent No.4 again took gold ornaments from father of the petitioner. On 23.07.2023, the petitioner was given beatings by her in-laws for giving birth to a girl child and ultimately, in the month of September, 2023, she was turned out of the matrimonial home. Respondent No.4 assured the petitioner to send a visa for her to migrate to USA, but he did not do so and even said that divorce is the only option. On 09.01.2024, the petitioner, under pressure, signed a statement before the Court for divorce by way of mutual consent and when she came to know about the condition of handing over custody of her minor daughter to respondent No.4 in the first motion statement, she withdrew her consent for divorce by way of mutual consent, on 01.08.2024. The petitioner made the complaints/representations dated 05.08.2024 (Annexure P-3) and 13.08.2024 (Annexure P-4), however, no action has been taken till date.

3. Having heard learned counsel for the petitioner and after perusing the record of the case with his able assistance, this Court finds no force in the arguments advanced on behalf of the petitioner.

4. A two Judge Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Sakiri Vasu Vs. State of U.P. and others, (2008) 2 SCC 409*** has held that the Magistrate

2024:PHHC:122305



has been bestowed with all necessary powers to ensure proper investigation under Section 156(3) Cr.P.C. Discouraging the practice of approaching the High Court for redressal of grievances like non-registration of FIR or improper investigation, Justice Markandey Katju made the following observations:

“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.

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.”

5. This ratio was reiterated in the judgments rendered by the Hon’ble Supreme Court in ***Sudhir Bhaskarrao Tambe Vs. Hemant Yashwant Dhange and others, (2016) 6 SCC 277*** and ***M. Subramaniam and another Vs. S. Janaki and another, (2020) 16 SCC 728.***



6. The High Courts, while exercising its inherent powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C., can issue directions for prompt and proper investigation, however, it would be out of bounds to instruct the investigation to be completed in a certain time frame, in alignment with the opinion expressed by it. The Courts must be conscious of its influence and not exercise the same in an unwarranted fashion as it may prejudice the conclusion of the investigating agency, straying further away from achieving the overarching goal of justice.

7. Further, even though the jurisdictional Magistrate is well equipped to deal with such type of matters, learned counsel for the petitioner has not able to provide a satisfactory response regarding approaching this Court directly instead of the concerned jurisdictional Court by filing an appropriate application under Section 156(3) Cr.P.C.

5. In view of the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is not inclined to issue any such direction. Accordingly, present petition is dismissed being bereft of any merit.

17.09.2024

vishnu

[HARPREET SINGH BRAR]
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No