

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPCR No. 369 of 2017**

Sunil Patel S/o Shri Babulal Patel, Aged About 28 Years R/o Rajak Mohhalla, Mangla, Police Station Civil Line, Bilaspur, Revenue & Civil District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Department Of Home Affairs Government Of Chhattisgarh, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Naya Raipur Chhattisgarh.
2. The Inspector General Of Police, Range Bilaspur, District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.
3. The Superintendant Of Police District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.
4. Station House Officer, Police Station Civil Line, District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.
5. Amit Kumar Kannoje S/o Ram Kumar Kannoje, R/o Kota, Police Station Kota, District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondents

For the Petitioner	: Shri Rupesh Shrivastava, Advocate.
For the Respondent/State	: Shri Neeraj Sharma,DGA.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rajendra Chandra Singh Samant**Order on Board****21.09.2017**

Heard.

1. This petition has been brought under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of an appropriate writ.
2. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that a complaint was made by him against respondents No.4 & 5 alleging that respondent No.5 has induced that he can arrange for the employment for the petitioner's nephew and obtained Rs. 30,52,400/- on various

dates and thus, he cheated him. A complaint addressed to respondent No.4 dated 30.06.2017 was submitted.

3. Later on a similar complaint was given to respondents No.2 & 3 as well, but no action has been taken till date.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has placed reliance on the Judgment of **Lalita Kumari vs. Government of Uttar Pradesh and Others** reported in **(2014) 2 SCC 1**.
5. Learned counsel for the State opposes the petition and submit that the case of the petitioner appears to be a civil dispute. However, if the Court disposes of this petition with a direction then the State has nothing to oppose.
6. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused all the documents placed on record.
7. Considering on the contents of the complaint made by the petitioner, it appears that the respondents should have taken action on the basis of the complaint made, keeping in view the Judgment of **Lalita Kumari vs. Government of Uttar Pradesh and Others** (supra). This petition is allowed at the admission stage.
8. Respondents No. 1,2,3 and 4 are directed to make an inquiry on the complaint made by petitioner and if necessary, register FIR and proceed accordingly in accordance with law.
9. Hence this petition is disposed off at the motion stage.

Sd /-

(Rajendra Chandra Singh Samant)

Judge