



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

CRM-M-34346-2025
Date of decision: 04.07.2025

Manjeet SinghPetitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Ajaypal Singh Aulakh, Advocate for
Mr. Amandeep Singh Manaise, Advocate
for the petitioner.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 528 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking issuance of directions to the official respondent No.2 for taking appropriate legal action on representation dated 16.06.2025 (Annexure P-3) pending before respondent No.2 and for registration of case against private respondent No.4 for cheating, breach of trust and threat.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that the petitioner purchased a Tractor from M/s Ganga Fields, Pathankot worth Rs.8.5 lac in his name and got the same financed from Indus Ind Bank and handed over the tractor to respondent No.4 with an understanding that he would pay the loan installments amounting to Rs.91,000/- half yearly. Further, respondent No.4 has only paid one installment to the bank in December, 2023 and bank officials started harassing the petitioner in order to recover the loan amount. When petitioner requested respondent No.4 to pay the loan installments, respondent No.4 started threatening the petitioner and has concealed the tractor



somewhere with an intention to misappropriate the same. It is thus prayed to issue an appropriate direction to the official respondents to take legal action against respondent No.4.

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 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.*

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.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

04.07.2025

Neha

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