



119 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-60265-2024
Date of decision: 02.12.2024

SajidaPetitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Ziaul Rasool, Advocate for
Mr. Nafees Ahmad Khan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Geeta Sharma, DAG, Haryana.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 528 of Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for issuance of directions to official
respondents to conduct fair and impartial investigation of the case bearing FIR
No.48 dated 21.08.2024 under Sections 323/406/498-A/506 of IPC, registered
at Police Station Women Police Station Mewat, District Nuh.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that the
marriage of the petitioner was solemnized with Waseem as per Muslim rites
and rituals and after marriage, her husband and in-laws started harassing her on
account of demand of dowry and resorted to physical violence. He further
submits that on 21.05.2024, when the petitioner was sleeping in her room at her
matrimonial home, accused-Yusuf entered in her room and tried to exploit her
physically and when the petitioner shouted, he ran away from the room.
Thereafter, the petitioner disclosed this fact to her husband and in-laws but
nobody heard her cries. She narrated the whole incident to her parents and they
complained her in-laws but the in-laws of the petitioner told them that if they



CRM-M-60265-2024

-2-

make a phone call again, they will kill the petitioner and further, gave merciless beatings to the petitioner and detained her in a room by extending threats to kill her and later on, the petitioner got a chance to run away and reached at her parental home. It is thus prayed to issue an appropriate direction to the official respondents to fairly investigate the FIR (*supra*).

3. The learned State counsel, at the very outset, on instructions from ASI Sumita, submits that the grievance raised by the petitioner in the present petition has been substantially redressed and thus, nothing survives in the present petition. She further submits that the investigating agency has already concluded the investigation and submitted the final report before the jurisdictional Court on 28.01.2024 before whom, equally efficacious remedy is available and who is well equipped to deal with such prayer.

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

5. 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 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.”

6. 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, M. Subramaniam and another Vs. S. Janaki and another, (2020) 16 SCC 728, Dilawar Singh vs. State of Delhi 2007(4) R.C.R(Criminal) 115.***

7. 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.

**CRM-M-60265-2024****-4-**

8. 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.

9. 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.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

02.12.2024*Neha*

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No