

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPCR No. 333 of 2017**

1. Tilak Raj Saluja S/o Late Melaram, Aged About 63 Years
President Press Club, Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.

---- **Petitioner****Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Home Department,
Mahanadi Bhawan, New Mantrayala, Naya Raipur,
(Chhattisgarh)
2. Superintendent Of Police, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur
(Chhattisgarh)
3. Station House Officer, Bilaspur, City Kotwali, Bilaspur, District
Bilaspur (Chhattisgarh)
4. The General Manager, South Eastern Central Railway, Zonal
Office, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur (Chhattisgarh)
5. Santosh Kumar Singh, Senior Public Relation Officer (Sr. P. R.
O.), South Eastern Central Railway, Zonal Office, Bilaspur,
District Bilaspur (Chhattisgarh)

---- **Respondents**

For the Petitioner : Shri Shikhar Bakhtiyar, Advocate.

For the Respondent/ State : Shri Anil S. Pandey, Government Advocate.

For respondent No.4. : Shri Abhishek Sinha, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rajendra Chandra Singh Samant**Judgment on Board**

08.09.2017

Heard.

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner was a
candidate in election for the post of President, Press Club,
Bilaspur. Respondent No.5 having no business with the Press
Club or with the election, canvassed for the opposite candidate
by sending whatsapp messages, to the voters, because of which

petitioner was defamed and that respondent No.5 being an employee of railway has committed misconduct. The complaint was made by respondent No.4 to take action against the respondent No.5, but no action was taken.

2. The petition has been brought with a prayer to issue direction that FIR be lodged against the respondent No.5 by respondent No.3.
3. Learned counsel for the State has opposed the writ petition and submits that if the case is disposed off with a direction then the State has nothing to oppose.
4. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused all the documents placed on record.
5. Perused the complaint copy attached with the records, the allegations made by the petitioner needs some inquiry, hence, the petitioner is directed to make a written complaint before the respondents No. 2 and 3 and respondents No.2 and 3 are directed to make an inquiry of this effect, whether, any cognizable offence is made out and to do the needful in accordance with the law.
6. This petition stands disposed of with the aforesaid directions.

Sd /-
(Rajendra Chandra Singh Samant)
Judge