



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

CRM-M-19175-2025

Date of decision: 07.04.2025

M/S GAANESH KARTIKEY CONSTRUCTIONS PVT. LTD.

...PETITIONER

V/S

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Ms. Nandita Verma, Advocate for the petitioner.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023 for issuance of directions to respondent Nos.2 to 6 to carry out fair, impartial and proper investigation in FIR No.0313 dated 04.12.2024 registered under Section 303(2) of BNS, 2023 at Police Station Jandiala, Amritsar Rural (Annexure P-2) in view of the representations dated 11.12.2024 vide Annexures P-3, P-4 and P-5.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that petitioner-company undertook a construction project for a vehicle underpass bridge on the National Highway and had stored construction materials i.e. sand, gravel, stone and stone dust mix worth Rs.50 lakhs at the site. However, on 01.12.2024, respondent No.7 stolen the material worth Rs.6 lakhs using a JCB machine and trolleys and utilized the same for parking area of his resort. Further, respondent No.7 had also threatened the petitioner's staff, when caught red handed. The petitioner has submitted a representation dated 11.12.2024 to the Commissioner of Police, Amritsar, however, no substantial action has been taken by the concerned police officials. It is thus prayed to



issue directions to respondent Nos.2 to 6 to inquire into the representations (Annexures P-3 to P-5) as per law.

3. Having heard learned counsel for the petitioner and after perusing the record of the case with her 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 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.

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 with liberty to the petitioner to avail alternative remedies as available to it in accordance with law.

April 07, 2025
manisha

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

(i)	Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
(ii)	Whether reportable	Yes/No