

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPCR No. 328 of 2018**

Arun Shukla S/o Late Shri Sushilchandra Shukla, Aged About 43 Years R/o Village Farhada, Post Gataura, District- Bilaspur At Present R/o Near Mahamaya, I. T. I. Ashok Nagar, Sarkanda, District- Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Home (Police) Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, New Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. The Superintendent Of Police, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.
3. The Station House Officer, Police Station, Sarkanda, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.
4. Tareh Shukla S/o Late Shri Sushilchand Shukla, R/o Village Farhada, Post Gataura, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondents

For petitioner – Shri Goutam Khetrapal, Advocate.
For State- Shri Ashish Shukla, Dy.A.G.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri**Order****25/06/2018**

Heard.

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was joint land holder alongwith respondent No.4. He submits that paddy has been sold to the society and sale consideration was to be paid to the petitioner who is also other share holder but instead by forged document showing ownership entire sale consideration has been usurped by respondent No.4 in connivance with the bank officials. It is stated that report was made to the Police Station SHO Sarkanda, however no cognizance has been taken.
2. 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.”

3. Perused the documents and the report. Report purports that report was made by fabrication of the documents and by false signature share of the sale consideration of the petitioner was usurped by respondent No.4 and others. Report was made to the police on 16/05/2018. Prima facie it reflects that cognizable offence was reported.

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 proceed in accordance with law.

Sd/-

(Goutam Bhaduri)

JUDGE

gouri