

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPCR No. 91 of 2018**

- Dinesh Singh Solanki S/o Late Shri Sahab Singh Solanki Aged About 33 Years
R/o Village Baroda Sadar Post Office Mahuar Police Station Malpura District
Agra (U. P.)

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary Home Department Mahanadi Bhawan New Raipur Chhattisgarh
 2. Director General Of Police , Chhattisgarh Raipur Chhattisgarh
 3. Inspector General Of Police , Bilaspur Range , Bilaspur District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh
 4. Superintendent Of Police , Bilaspur District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh
 5. Station House Officer , Police Station Kota , Karagi Road Bilaspur District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh
 6. Sarju Prasad Mishra S/o Shiv Prasad Mishra Aged About 46 Years
 7. Santos Mishra S/o Shiv Prasad Mishra Aged About 44 Years
- Respondents No.6 & 7 are R/o Flat No. 303 , Siddh Shikhar Apartment Shanti Nagar Bilaspur District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh
8. Ankit Mishra Aged About 31 Years, R/o Gatava Kreshar , Amali , Police Station Kota , District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner : Shri A.S. Rajput, Advocate

For Respondent/State : Shri Chandresh Shrivastava, Dy. AG for the State

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri**Order On Board****21/02/2019**

1. Heard.
2. The present petition is for registration of the FIR, which discloses a cognizable

offence.

3. It is contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner who is resident of Agra has made a report but it was not registered and he is being threatened that he could not even enter into the periphery of the police station Kargi Road, Kota as threat looms large.
4. Learned State counsel submits that the conduct of the petitioner would show that he himself has compromised with the respondent No.6, therefore, it appears that it was an inter se monetary dispute in between the parties and the petitioner has not come forward to record his statement.
5. Be that as it may, perusal of the Annexure P-4 would show that cognizable offence has been reported, therefore, the police was bound to register the FIR as per the directions given by the Supreme Court in the case of ***Lalita Kumari Vs. Government of Uttar Pradesh and others {(2014) 2 SCC 1}***, therefore, the concerned police is directed to register the FIR and after registration of the FIR the statement of the petitioner may be recorded on a fixed dated and if need be, he may be protected from manhandling for which the in-charge of the concerned police station shall be liable to provide security. The petitioner shall intimate this order to the concerned police so that the compliance of this order may be carried out. It is further made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case.
6. With such observation, the petition stands disposed of.

Sd/-

Goutam Bhaduri
Judge

Ashu