

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Cr.M.P. No.299 of 2016**

Savita Bai Patel W/o Late Shri Puran Lal Patel Aged About 58 Years
R/o Village Chainpur, Police Station & Tahsil Kartala, District Korba
Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. Geeta Prasad Patel S/o Shri Jhabulal Patel Aged About 43 Years R/o Village Chainpur, Police Station & Tahsil - Kartala, District Korba Chhattisgarh.
2. Smt. Sushila Bai Rathia W/o Shri Ram Narayan Rathia Aged About 25 Years R/o Village Chainpur, Police Station & Tahsil Kartala, District Korba Chhattisgarh.
3. Mohar Sai S/o Bodhram Aged About 63 Years R/o Village Chainpur, Police Station & Tahsil Kartala, District Korba Chhattisgarh.
4. Firtu Ram Nagesiya Secretary Gram Panchayat Chainpur, Police Station & Tahsil Kartala, District Korba Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondents

For Petitioner : Mr. Roop Naik, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal
Order On Board

09/05/2017

(1) The petitioner/complainant filed complaint under Sections 200 & 156(3) of Cr.P.C. against the respondents for registered the offence under Section 418 of IPC, which was rejected by the trial Court holding that the complaint does not disclose any offence under Section 418 of IPC by its order dated 28.01.2014. Against that order, the petitioner/complainant filed revision before the revisional Court, which has been rejected by the revisional Court and affirmed the order

of trial Court by its impugned order dated 30.11.2015 declining to take cognizance against the respondents against which, this petition under Section 482 of CrPC has been filed by the petitioner/complainant herein.

(2) Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would vehemently submit that the order passed by the trial Court as affirmed by the revisional Court, which is liable to be set-aside.

(3) I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the impugned order with utmost circumspection.

(4) The trial Court has clearly held that against the order of mutation, the interim order has been granted by the Tahsildar and revenue case is still pending and dispute is in civil nature between the parties. The revisional Court has also recorded sufficient and valid reasons for affirming the order of trial Court.

(5) After hearing learned counsel for the petitioner and after going through the record of the trial Court and revisional Court in which I do not find any jurisdictional error in the impugned order.

(6) Consequently, the petition deserves to be and is accordingly dismissed.

Sd/-

(Sanjay K. Agrawal)
Judge

L/-