

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPCR No. 35 of 2018**

Khatija Rahman, W/o. S.M. Rahman, Aged About 55 Years, R/o. Dau Mill Gali, Ground Floor, Jawahar Lal Nehru Ward, Nayapara, Jagdalpur, District Bastar (Chhattisgarh).

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh, Through Secretary, Department Of Home Affairs (Police), New Raipur, Mantralaya, New Raipur, Civil & Revenue District Raipur (Chhattisgarh).
2. Director General Of Police, Raipur, District Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
3. Inspector General Of Police, Range Jagdalpur, District Bastar (Chhattisgarh)
4. Superintendent Of Police, Bastar, Civil & Revenue District Bastar (Chhattisgarh)
5. District Magistrate, Jagdalpur, Civil & Revenue District Bastar (Chhattisgarh)
6. Station House Officer, Police Station City Kotwali, District Bastar (Chhattisgarh)
7. S.N. Rahman, S/o. Late S.M. Rahman, Aged About 90 Years, R/o. Dau Mill Gali, Ground Floor, Jawahar Lal Nehru Ward, Nayapara, Jagdalpur, District Bastar (Chhattisgarh)
8. Rajendra Tiwari, Aged About 50 Years, Editor Of Highway Channel Newspaper, Jagdalpur, District Bastar (Chhattisgarh)

---- Respondents

For Petitioner : Shri Punit Ruparel, Advocate

For Respondents-State : Shri S.K.Mishra, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri**Order On Board****19/01/2018**

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that despite the complaint made against the respondent No.7 & 8 on 01.09.2017 & 04.09.2017, the FIR is not registered though the allegations made that of the cognizable offence.

2. The petitioner has claimed the following reliefs in this petition:-

(i) That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to direct the respondent authority (respondent No.6) to register an FIR against the respondent No.7 & 8 in the offence punishable as mentioned above.

(ii) That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to direct the respondent authorities to ensure the petitioner that her life and limb is secure within their jurisdiction.

(iii) That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to direct the respondent No.1 to 6 to take action against the culprits respondents No.7 & 8.

(iv) Cost of the petition may also be granted to the petitioner.

(v). Any other relief, which this Hon'ble Court deems fit and proper, may also, kindly be granted to the petitioner in the interest of justice.

3. The Supreme Court in ***Lalita Kumari Vs. Government of Uttar Pradesh and others*** {(2014) 2 SCC 1} has held as follows:-

“**120.** In view of the aforesaid discussion, we hold:

120.1. The registration of FIR is mandatory under Section 154 of the Code, if the information discloses commission of a cognizable offence and no preliminary inquiry is permissible in such a situation.

120.2. If the information received does not disclose a cognizable offence but indicates the necessity for an inquiry, a preliminary inquiry may be conducted only to ascertain whether cognizable offence is disclosed or not.

120.3. If the inquiry discloses the commission of a cognizable offence, the FIR must be registered. In cases where preliminary inquiry ends in closing the complaint, a copy of the entry of such closure must be supplied to the first informant forthwith and not later than one week. It must disclose reasons in brief for closing the complaint and not proceeding further.

120.4. The police officer cannot avoid his duty of registering offence if cognizable offence is disclosed. Action must be taken against erring officers who do not register the FIR if information received by him discloses a cognizable offence.

120.5. The scope of preliminary inquiry is not to verify the veracity or otherwise of the information received but only to ascertain whether the information reveals any cognizable offence.

120.6. As to what type and in which cases preliminary inquiry is to be conducted will depend on the facts and circumstances of each case. The category of cases in which preliminary inquiry may be made are as under:

- (a) Matrimonial disputes/family disputes
- (b) Commercial offences
- (c) Medical negligence cases
- (d) Corruption cases
- (e) Cases where there is abnormal delay/laches in initiating criminal prosecution, for example, over 3 months' delay in reporting the matter without satisfactorily explaining the reasons for delay.

The aforesaid are only illustrations and not exhaustive of all conditions which may warrant preliminary inquiry.

120.7. While ensuring and protecting the rights of the accused and the complainant, a preliminary inquiry should be made time-bound and in any case it should not exceed 7 days. The fact of such delay and the causes of it must be reflected in the General Diary entry.

120.8. Since the General Diary/Station Diary/Daily Diary is the record of all information received in a police station, we direct that all information relating to cognizable offences, whether resulting in registration of FIR or leading to an inquiry, must be mandatorily and meticulously reflected in the said diary and the decision to conduct a preliminary inquiry must also be reflected, as mentioned above.”

4. Considering the above law laid down by the Supreme Court, the writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the concerned police to investigate the matter in accordance with law laid down by the Supreme Court in ***Lalita Kumari (supra)*** and submit the report before the competent criminal Court.

Sd/-
Goutam Bhaduri
Judge

ashok