

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

Order Sheet

MCC No. 118 of 2017

In Reference On Its Own Motion **Versus** Superintendent Of Police, Central Bureau Of Investigation, Anti Corruption Branch, Chhattisgarh

17/02/2017	This is an office reference. Shri Kishore Bhaduri, Standing counsel for the CBI. Shri Ratnesh Kumar Agrawal, Advocate for the interveners. Shri Asra Garg, Superintendent of Police, Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI), Anti Corruption Branch (ACB), Bhilai (C.G.) and Shri Rajesh Bhonsle, Inspector of Police, CBI, ACB, Chhattisgarh, Bhilai are also present in the Court. Heard. Shri Bhaduri, learned standing counsel for the CBI, duly assisted by Shri Asra Garg, Superintendent of Police, Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI) and Shri Rajesh Bhonsle, Inspector of Police, CBI, ACB, Chhattisgarh would submit that the CBI has taken up the investigation in all the 32 primary societies, however, since for Ghutku Society FIR was already registered, the same FIR has been transferred to the CBI and in remaining 31 cases, the CBI has undertaken preliminary investigation, on completion of which, a regular case (FIR) shall be registered. Shri Asra Garg, Superintendent of Police, Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI) would further explain that the order passed by this Court in the writ petition was communicated to the CBI after about six months,	

therefore, the direction to complete the investigation within eight months may not be possible. He would pray for extension of time to complete the investigation.

On due consideration, the time allowed for completion of investigation is extended by additional six months.

Shri Ratnesh Agrawal, learned counsel who had appeared for the petitioners in the writ petition, has filed an intervention application bringing into notice of this Court the non-compliance of the order, inasmuch as, the interveners named in the application have not been paid the principal amount along with accrued interest which they had deposited with the respective primary societies.

If the statement made by Shri Ratnesh Agrawal is correct, there would be contempt of the lawful authority of this Court because the direction was for making payment within a period of six months.

Shri Agrawal is directed to file a representation before the District Central Cooperative Bank, Bilaspur (for short 'the DCCB') within a week. The DCCB shall make necessary payment to the interveners within a month from the date of submission of representation, failing which the interveners would be at liberty to move contempt application before this Court. In such eventuality this Court shall be constrained to take coercive steps against the officials of the DCCB who may be found to have violated the Court order.

In view of the above, the office reference stands disposed of.

Sd/-

Judge
Prashant Kumar Mishra

Ashu