

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

W.P.(CR.) No. 232 of 2017

Smt. Khatija Rahman Wd/o Shri S.M.Rahman, Aged About 58 Years R/o Motilal Nehru Ward, 1st Floor, Thana Kotwali, Nayapara, Jagdalpur, District Bastar, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Department Of Home Affairs (Police), New Raipur Mantralaya, New Raipur, Civil And Revenue District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Director General Of Police, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. Inspector General Of Police, Range Bastar, District Bastar, Chhattisgarh
4. Superintendent Of Police, Jagdalpur, Civil & Revenue District Bastar, Chhattisgarh
5. District Magistrate, Jagdalpur, Civil & Revenue District Bastar, Chhattisgarh
6. Station House Officer, Police Station Parpa, Civil And Revenue District Bastar, Chhattisgarh
7. Rajnish Das S/o Vijay Das, Aged About 35 Years R/o Near Collector Office, Mission Compound, P.S. Bodghat, District Jagdalpur, District Bastar, Chhattisgarh

-----Respondents

For Petitioner	: Mr. Punit Ruparel, Advocate
For Respondent/State	: Mr. Neeraj Sharma, Govt. Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rajendra Chandra Singh Samant

Order On Board

24/07/2017

Heard.

1. This petition has been brought with prayer to exercise jurisdiction under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India with respect to the complaint lodged by petitioner against respondent No.7, which has been registered in Police Station -Parpa, District -Bastar under Section 354-A of I.P.C.
2. The grievance of the petitioner is that despite lodging the F.I.R on

13.04.2017, respondent No.7 has not been arrested by the police. Consequent to that petitioner had placed a complaint before Inspector General of Police, Jagdalpur, District Bastar, Chhattisgarh with prayer for taking necessary action on her complaint and she has presented a number of applications for taking action against respondent No. 7, but no action has been taken till date.

3. It is submitted by Counsel for the petitioner that this petition may be disposed of with suitable direction.
4. Counsel for the State has no objection, if the, case is disposed off with suitable direction.
5. Looking to the contents of F.I.R and the written complaints made by the petitioner to the police authorities, it appears that respondent No. 1 to 6 have taken no interest till date to conduct investigation and do the needful in this respect, which includes the arrest of the person named in the F.I.R.
6. There has been no approach made by respondent No.1 to 6 in letter and spirit to the direction given in case of *Lalita Kumari Vs. Government of Uttar Pradesh & Others, reported in (2014) 2 SCC 1* and in the case of *Krishna Kumar Sahu Vs. State of Chhattisgarh, W.P.(Cr.) No.16 of 2012*, passed by this Court. Hence the respondent No.1 to 6 are directed to take necessary action in conducting the investigative procedure as per the law and do the needful as early as possible.
7. This petition is disposed of with these directions.

Sd/-
(Rajendra Chandra Singh Samant)
Judge