
(2019) 02 CHH CK 0419

Chhattisgarh High Court

Case No: WPCR No. 71 Of 2019

Goutam Dewangan

APPELLANT

Vs

State Of Chhattisgarh
And Ors

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision: Feb. 22, 2019

Citation: (2019) 02 CHH CK 0419

Hon'ble Judges: Goutam Bhaduri, J

Bench: Single Bench

Advocate: Achal Kumar Matre, Akash Pandey

Final Decision: Disposed Of

Judgement

Goutam Bhaduri, J

1. Heard.

2. The present petition is for registering the FIR against Sai Prasad Group's Company and its Directors.

3. It is stated that the petitioner has sent a complaint to the Superintendent of Police, Mahasamund and the S.H.O., Police Station Komakhan District

Mahasamund, despite that the FIR has not been registered against the company and the persons involved.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that though different reports were sent but no action has been taken till today.

5. Learned State counsel submits that along with the copy of the complaint different names have been given by the petitioner. It is stated that the

petitioner himself has admitted the fact that he was one of the agents, who allured the other persons to deposit money in the company, therefore, he may be one of the accused.

6. Perusal of the complaint shows that petitioner himself invested the money in the company as also persuaded the other persons to deposit.

Therefore, irrespective of the fact the role played by the petitioner, over all reading of the complaint shows that the cognizable offence is reported,

therefore, as per the law laid down in the matter of Lalita Kumari Vs. Government of Uttar Pradesh and others {(2014) 2 SCC 1,} the police is

obliged to register the FIR and the Police is directed to lodge the FIR. It is further made clear that this Court has not passed any opinion as to the

number of persons who have been named in the FIR, it is for the police to investigate, including the role played by the petitioner himself and it is

expected that police shall proceed with the enquiry after registration of the FIR against the erring persons and the persons who were in hold of the

affairs of the company. It is further made clear that the police officer while registering the FIR shall not be swayed away by the versions of the

persons named in the FIR, as it is according to the petitioner itself and the Court has not expressed any opinion on the same.

7. With such observation, the petition stands disposed of.