

**ORDER SHEET**  
**THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH KARACHI**  
Cr. Misc. Application No.716 of 2024

**DATE**

**ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE**

Fresh Case.

1. For orders on MA No.9164/2024.
2. For orders on office objection & reply of Adv at Flag A.
3. For orders on MA No.9165/2024.
4. For hearing of main case.
5. For orders on MA No.9166/2024.

**Date of hearing and Order:- 11.07.2024**

Mr. Irshad Ali Bhatti, advocate for the applicant.

-----  
**ORDER**

**Adnan-ul-Karim Memon, J:-** The applicant Muhammad Ibrahim has approached this Court against the order dated 06.07.2024 passed by the learned Session Judge Sajawal in Cr. Misc: Application No. 163/2024, whereby the following direction has been issued:-

*I have heard the learned counsel for the applicant as well as the applicant in person. According to the applicant, she was coming from Karachi towards Chuhar Jamali Village at about 08:00 p.m where police officials maltreated and misbehaved with her as well as Mst. Sajida and Mst. Jato and those police officials also snatched the articles including the case amount. One of the police officials identified by the applicant as P.C Ibrahim Otho of P.S Chuhar Jamali, so no doubt the police report does not support the version of the applicant but from the above position cognizable offense has been made out.*

*Therefore, the SHO of P.S Chuhar Jamali is directed to lodge the FIR against P.C Ibrahim Othor forthwith as and when the applicant appears at P.S.*

2. Learned counsel states that the impugned order is against the law as respondent No.4 approached the trial Court with an unclean hand. In support of his contention, he relied upon an inquiry report submitted before the trial Court, prima facie suggesting that respondent No.4 expressed her unwillingness to recognize the applicant, in such a scenario no case for lodging of FIR was made out. He prayed for allowing the criminal Misc. application.

3. I have heard the learned counsel for the applicant on the maintainability of this Criminal Misc. Application and perused the record with his assistance.

4. I have noticed that the Supreme Court in the recent judgment has dilated upon Section 22-A, Cr. P.C, and held that it is not the function of the Justice of Peace to punctiliously or assiduously scrutinize the case or to render any findings on merits but he has to ensure whether, from the facts narrated in the application, any cognizable case is made out or not; and if yes, then he can issue directions that the statement of the complainant be recorded under Section 154. Such powers of the Justice of Peace are limited to aid and assist in the administration of the criminal justice system. He has no right to assume the role of an investigating agency or a prosecutor but has been conferred with a role of vigilance to redress the grievance of those complainants who have been refused by the police officials to register their reports. If the Justice of Peace assumes and undertakes a full-fledged investigation and inquiry before the registration of FIR, then every person will have to first approach the Justice of Peace for scrutiny of his complaint and only after clearance, his FIR will be registered, which is beyond the comprehension, prudence, and intention of the legislature.

5. Minute examination of a case and conducting a fact-finding exercise are not included in the functions of a Justice of Peace but he is saddled with a sense of duty to redress the grievance of the complainant who is aggrieved by the refusal of a Police Officer to register his report. The offenses have been categorized by the Cr.P.C. into two classes i.e., cognizable and non-cognizable. Section 154 of the Cr.P.C. lays down a procedure for conveying information to an S.H.O. to the commission of a cognizable offense, while the provisions of Section 155 (1) of the Cr.P.C. articulates the procedure vis-à-vis a non-cognizable offense.

6. At whatever time, an Officer in charge of a Police Station receives some information about the commission of an offense, he is expected first to find out whether the offense disclosed fell into the category of cognizable offenses or non-cognizable offenses. There is no provision in any law, including Section 154 or 155 of the Cr.P.C., which authorizes an Officer Incharge of a Police Station to hold any inquiry to assess the correctness or falsity of the information before complying with the command of the said provisions. He is obligated to reduce the same into writing, notwithstanding the fact whether such information is true or otherwise.

7. The condition precedent for recording an FIR is that it should convey the information of an offense and that too a cognizable one. The remedy of filing a direct complaint cannot measure or match up to the

mechanism provided under section 154, Cr.P.C., in which the Officer Incharge of a Police Station is duty-bound to record the statement and register the FIR if a cognizable offence is made out. If in every case it is presumed or assumed that instead of insisting or emphasizing the lodgment of an FIR, the party may file a direct complaint, then the purpose of recording an FIR, as envisaged under section 154, Cr.P.C., will become redundant and futile and it would be very easy for the police to refuse the registration of an FIR with the advice to file a direct complaint. However, in some exceptional circumstances, the alternate remedy in the shape of a direct complaint may be availed but not in every case.

8. The statutory duty casts upon the officer of a police station to enter information regarding the cognizable offense first and then the investigation comes later to gather evidence and other relevant material to prosecute the identified culprits. No doubt, an Investigating Officer plays a crucial role in the administration of the criminal justice system and the constituent of the investigation report and its worth keeps hold of plenteous value and repercussions on the outcome of any criminal case, but tainted investigations can become an acute obstacle in the administration of justice. In the case of *Sughra Bibi vs. State* [PLD 2018 SC 595], it was held that during the investigation, the Investigating Officer is obliged to investigate the matter from all possible angles while keeping in view all the versions of the incident brought to his notice and as required by Rule 25.2(3) of the Police Rules, 1934. An Investigating Officer has to find out the truth of the matter under investigation. His object shall be to discover the facts of the case and to arrest the real offender or offenders. He shall not commit himself prematurely to any view of the facts for or against any person. Whereas in the case of *Babubhai v. State of Gujrat and others* [(2010) 12 SCC 254], the Supreme Court of India held that investigation must be fair, transparent, and judicious as it is the minimum requirement of the rule of law.

9. Investigative activities serve a multitude of purposes, therefore, it is also the duty of the Officer Incharge of Police Stations to ensure that the Investigating Officer follows the provisions of law conscientiously, without any breach, conducting an impartial and honest investigation with the sole aim of bringing the truth to light, which is the foundational pathway for the prosecution's case.

10. In case of declining the registration of FIR or recording the statement, the aggrieved person has a right to approach under Section 22-A, Cr.P.C. and file any such application, and the Justice of Peace is

obligated to examine it and, after hearing the parties, pass an appropriate order.

11. In view of the above facts and circumstances of the case, and the law discussed supra, the impugned order is perfect and no need for further indulgence. This Cr. Misc. Application is dismissed in *limine* along with pending applications.

JUDGE

Shafi