

1HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A.RAJASHEKER REDDY

WRIT PETITION No.23386 of 2018

ORDER:

The grievance of the petitioner is that the respondent-police are not taking action on the complaint of the petitioner dated 07-05-2018 and not registering the FIR and not protecting the petitioner from illegal acts of respondents 5 to 7 and their henchmen by providing protection.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, who submits that the petitioner made complaint, which constitutes cognizable offence and the respondents have to take action in terms of Apex Court judgment in **Lalitha Kumari v. Government of Uttar Pradesh**¹. But the respondent-authorities are not taking action.

Learned Assistant Government Pleader for Home produced written instructions stating that as many as eight cases are registered against the petitioner and rowdy sheet was also opened against the petitioner on 28-05-2011 and earlier the petitioner filed complaint on 05-03-2018 and the same was also enquired into and the petitioner filed earlier WP.No.8104 of 2018 alleging inaction on the said complaint. As such, the present writ petition is hit by principles of resjudicata.

In this case, it is to be seen that earlier the petitioner was complaining about non-registration of crime dated 05-03-2018 and filed the above said writ petition and this Court granted interim order. Now the petitioner made complaint

¹ (2014)2SCC1

on 07-05-2018 alleging that cognizable offence has been committed by the unofficial respondents. The said complaint of the petitioner was also received by the Superintendent of Police, Tirupati Urban District and the same was entrusted to the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Mahila Police Station, Tirupati on 19-05-2018 for enquiry and report. It is stated that report was also received on 18-05-2018.

It is to be seen that the Apex Court has issued guidelines in respect of registration of crimes that whenever complaints are filed, the concerned police have to take action on the same in terms of guidelines laid down in the Apex Court judgment of **Lalitha Kumari's** case cited supra.

In view of the same, the writ petition is disposed of directing the respondent-police to take action on the complaint of the petitioner in accordance with guidelines laid down in **Lalitha Kumari's** case cited supra. As a sequel to the disposal of this petition, miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending shall stand closed.

A.RAJASHEKER REDDY,J

25-07-2018
Nvl



