



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

**CWP-3165-2016
Date of Decision : 14.01.2025**

RANJIT SINGH

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB & OTHERS

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present : Mr. Rajiv Kataria, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sahil R. Bakshi, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. K.S.Sidhu, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Kartik Bansal, Advocate,
for respondents no.2 to 4.

Mr. Virender Pratap Singh, Advocate,
for respondent no.5.

Mr. Abhinav Gupta, Addl.P.P., UT, Chandigarh.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J.(Oral)

1. Through the instant writ petition filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, a prayer is made for issuance of a *mandamus* upon respondent no.6 to register an FIR against respondents no.3 and 5, on the basis of the complaint (Annexure P-11), dated 23.01.2009, which is pending consideration before the Economic Offence Wing of respondent no.6.

2. What reflects from the reply dated 27.03.2023, filed by on behalf of respondent no.1, *qua* the set of allegations, a private complaint (Annexure R-2), has already been filed, which is pending consideration before the leearned *Illaqa* Magistrate concerned.

3. Since the same allegations through a private complaint (Annexure R-2), are now under consideration before the learned *Illaqa* Magistrate concerned, no directions, as sought through the instant writ petition, are required to be passed. Therefore, the instant petition is **dismissed**.

4. Even as a matter of fact, the petitioner without availing the efficacious alternate remedy, has filed the instant motion. Therefore, the instant motion can also be termed as a misconceived motion.

January 14, 2025
dharamvir

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

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