

GAHC010107752020



THE GAUHATI HIGH COURT
(HIGH COURT OF ASSAM, NAGALAND, MIZORAM AND ARUNACHAL PRADESH)

Case No. : WP(C)/3253/2020

M/S GOELS COIR FOM (INDIA) PVT. LTD. AND ANR
A REGD. COMPANIES UNDER THE INDIAN COMPANIES ACT, 1956, HAVING
ITS REGD. OFFICE AND PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS AT V-6, RAMPUR
GARDEN, NEAR AGRASEN PARK, BAREILLY- 243001, UTTAR PRADESH
AND IS REP. BY ITS DULY AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE MR. RAKESH
KUMAR GARG

2: SRI PRAVEEN KUMAR SOLANKI
S/O GITAM SINGH SONLANKI

RESIDENT OF C-3 E PARLAY RESIDENCY
SB HOUSING SOCIETY JAYANAGAR
GUWAHATI ASSAM 78102

VERSUS

THE STATE OF ASSAM AND 4 ORS
REP. BY THE COMM. AND SECY., DEPT. OF HOME, GOVT. OF ASSAM,
DISPUR, GHY-6

2:THE DIRECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE
ULUBARI
GHY
ASSAM
PIN- 781007

3:THE COMMISSIONER OF POLICE
PANBAZAR
GHY
ASSAM
PIN- 781008

4:THE OFFICER-IN-CHARGE
DISPUR P.S.

GUWAHATI
ASSAM
PIN- 781006

5:THE OFFICER-IN-CHARGE
CHANDMARI
P.S.
GHY
ASSAM
PIN- 78100

Advocate for the Petitioner : MR A K RAI, MR. S HAZARIKA,MR. J BHARALI,MS. M DEY

Advocate for the Respondent : GA, ASSAM,

BEFORE
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN DEV CHOUDHURY

ORDER

Date : 21-08-2024

- 1.** It is the case of the petitioners that they had lodged 5 FIRs, one before the Officer In-charge, Chandmari Police Station and four others before the Dispur Police Station. The FIR lodged in Chandmari Police Station was registered as Chandmari P.S. Case No. 214/2018 and FIRs registered in Dispur Police Station were registered as Dispur P.S. Case Nos. 3244/2017, 261/2018, 1187/2018 and 904/2019.
- 2.** It was the allegation in the writ petition that in spite of the FIRs being lodged, no effective investigation has been carried out by the police.
- 3.** The State respondent has filed an affidavit and has taken a stand that charge-sheet in respect of all the four cases under Dispur Police Station has been filed after proper investigation.

- 4.** Such fact has not been disputed by the learned counsel for the petitioners.
- 5.** As regards the Chandmari Police Station case it is the submission of the learned counsel for the petitioners that charge-sheet has not yet been filed and therefore, at this stage a direction may be issued to file the charge-sheet.
- 6.** Contrary to that Mr. A. Gogoi, learned Government Advocate submits that investigation is almost complete and the Investigating Officer of the case had issued notice to the informant for further recording his statement in certain aspect of the matter, however, the complainant himself is not appearing before the Investigating Officer.
- 7.** Be that as it may, as the investigations are complete, we do not find any purpose in keeping this writ petition alive, in view of the facts recorded herein above.

Accordingly, the writ petition stands closed.

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant