

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

Order Sheet

WPCR No. 193 of 2018

Upendra Sahu S/o Shri Sudama Prasad Sahu Aged About 37 Years R/o H. No. 641, Village- Harratola, Police Station And Tahsil Baikunthpur District Korea Chhattisgarh.
--- **Petitioner**

Versus

1. State of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary Department of Home, Indravati Bhawan New Raipur Chhattisgarh.
2. Collector Korea, Baikunthpur, District Korea Chhattisgarh.
3. Inspector General of Police (Surguja Range) Ambikapur , District Surguja Chhattisgarh.
4. Superintendent of Police Baikunthpur District Korea Chhattisgarh.
5. In - Charge Office of Police Station Baikunthpur District Korea Chhattisgarh.
6. Ramesh Chandra Sahu S/o Bhola Prasad Sahu Aged About 47 Years R/o Village Harra Para Police And Tahsil Baikunthpur District Korea Chhattisgarh.

--- **Respondents**

04.04.2018	Shri J.K. Shastri, Counsel for the petitioner. Shri Adhiraj Surana, Dy. G.A. for the State. Heard. In this writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the petitioner has sought the following relief(s) : “10.1 This Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to issue a writ of mandamus as well as other appropriate writ/order/ direction commanding the respondents particularly respondents No.1 to 5 to lodge First Information Report against the respondent No.6. 10.2 This Hon'ble Court may further be pleased to pass an appropriate direction/order to the respondent No.1 to 5 to provide the sufficient Police Protection as well as others to the petitioner.

R a o	10.3 Any other relief(s), which may deem fit looking to the facts and circumstances of the case may be granted to the petitioner.” Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that despite the complaints made to the police authorities for commission of cognizable offence vide Annexure P-1 dated 10.09.2015, Annexure P-3 dt. 1.10.2015, Annexure P-4 dated 24.8.2016, Annexure P-7 dated 14.4.2017, till date the FIR has not been registered by the police authorities. A perusal of the report dated 10.09.2015 purports that a stay was existing for transfer certain lands whereas the said lands are being subject of sale. In respect of demarcation of lands which is claimed by the petitioner if at all any stay is existing for sale of land, the petitioner can very well seek his redressal of grievance in appropriate civil forum or he can take recourse to appropriate proceeding before any authority. Considering the documents, I do not find that any cognizable offence is reported to have been alleged in this case. Therefore, I am not inclined to allow this petition. Accordingly, this writ petition is dismissed. Sd/- GOUTAM BHADURI JUDGE
-------	---