

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**

**WPCR No. 159 of 2015**

Mirza Dawood Baig S/o Late Shri Mirza Aalam Baig Aged About 58 years R/o- D-250, M.R. Colony, Tagore Nagar, P.S.- Kotwali, Raipur, Civil & Revenue Distt.- Raipur (Chhattisgarh)

**---- Petitioner**

**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Home Department, Mahanadi Bhavan, New Raipur, Civil & Revenue Distt.- Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
2. Inspector General Of Police (Range), Raipur, Civil & Revenue Distt.- Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
3. Superintendent Of Police, Raipur, Civil & Revenue Distt.- Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
4. Station House Officer, Police Station- Kotwali, Raipur, Civil & Revenue Distt.- Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
5. Station House Officer, Police Station- Mahila Thana, Raipur, Civil & Revenue Distt.- Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
6. Shahana Gazala W/o Aasif Malik Baig Aged About 29 Years R/o- Near Shanti General Store, Ekta Chowk, Laxmi Nagar, Pachpedi Naka, P.S.- Tikrapara, Raipur, Civil & Revenue Distt.- Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
7. Shabbir Mohammad Qureshi S/o Late Rajjak Mohamad Qureshi Aged About 58 Years R/o- Near Shanti General Store, Ekta Chowk, Laxmi Nagar, Pachpedi Naka, P.S.- Tikrapara, Raipur, Civil & Revenue Distt.- Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
8. Aamna Qureshi W/o Shabbir Mohammad Qureshi Aged About 57 Years R/o- Near Shanti General Store, Ekta Chowk, Laxmi Nagar, Pachpedi Naka, P.S.- Tikrapara , Raipur, Civil & Revenue Distt.- Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
9. Abdul Majid Khan S/o Late Haee Khan Aged About 67 Years R/o- Near Nagar Nigam Garden , Shyam Nagar, Telibanadha, Raipur, Civil & Revenue Distt.- Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
10. Talat Mohammad S/o F.M. Khan Aged About 46 Years R/o D- 45 Hansa Sadan, Agya Nagar, P.S.- Civil Lines Telibanadha, Bilaspur, Civil & Revenue Distt.- Bilaspur (Chhattisgarh)
11. Sayyed Yasir Arafat S/o Sayyed Safiuddin Aged About 39 Years R/o Sultan Palia, R.T. Nagar, P.S.- R.T. Nagar, Bengaluru, (Karnataka) 560032

**---- Respondents**

---

Shri Sunil Sahu, counsel for the petitioner/s.  
Shri R.K.Gupta, Dy.A.G. for the State.

---

### **Order On Board**

**31/07/2015**

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that even though the petitioner has submitted report disclosing cognizable offence, the police has not registered offence.

2. In the case of **Lalita Kumari v. Government of Uttar Pradesh and others, 2008 (7) SCC 164**, the Supreme Court held -

“**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. In view of above, the respondent authorities are directed to consider the complaint of the petitioner and act in accordance with law and judgment in the case of **Lalita Kumari (supra)**.

**Sd/-**  
**Manindra Mohan Shrivastava**  
**Judge**