



115

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-3855-2025

Date of decision: 24.01.2025

Sidharth Singh Baidwan

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR**Present:** Mr. Maninder Arora, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Subhash Godara, Addl.A.G., Punjab.

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 respondents No.2 & 3 to proceed with the complaint filed by the petitioner dated 31.12.2024 vide UID No.501488 (Annexure P-8) which is pending before respondent No.3 at the instance of respondent No.2.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that the respondent No.4 is the real grandmother of the petitioner and the property, in dispute, was owned by late Sh. Satinder Singh, father of the petitioner and son of respondent No.4 and both of them are joint owner in possession of the same in equal share. After the death of Sh. Satinder Singh, the petitioner and respondent No.4 are only legal heirs of deceased and inherited the suit property in equal share being 1st class legal heirs of the deceased as the deceased got an *ex parte* decree of divorce from his wife vide decree dated 16.12.1999 in petition No. HMA Case No.300 of 1997. It is further alleged that respondent



CRM-M-3855-2025

-2-

No.4 in connivance with *Lambardar* i.e. respondent No.7 and revenue officials got entered the mutation of the suit property in the revenue record by preparing wrong pedigree table in which the name of the plaintiff has been concealed. Respondent No.4 by concealing the facts got the mutation entered and sanctioned in her own name and got the suit property transferred in her name illegally. Thereafter, the petitioner filed a suit for declaration vide No.683 of 2024 which is pending for 10.02.2025 (Annexure P-6). It is thus prayed to issue an appropriate direction to the official respondents to fairly investigate the matter.

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 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 Dhangre 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.***

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

**CRM-M-3855-2025****-4-**

instead of the concerned jurisdictional Court by filing an appropriate application under Section 156(3) Cr.P.C.

8. 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

24.01.2025*Neha*

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