



2026:CGHC:9931-DB



2026:CGHC:9931-DB

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPCR No. 113 of 2026

Leenu George S/o Shri P.V. George, Aged About 41 Years R/o Beladula,
Chakradhar Nagar, Raigarh, Tahsil And District- Raigarh (C.G.)

... Petitioner

versus

**1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Ministry Of Home,
Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya , Naya Raipur, District- Raipur (C.G.)**

2 - The Inspector General Of Police Bilaspur Division, District- Bilaspur (C.G.)

3 - The District Magistrate Raigarh District- Raigarh (C.G.)

4 - The Superintendent Of Police Raigarh District- Raigarh (C.G.)

**5 - The Station House Officer, Police Station Chakradhar Nagar, District-
Raigarh (C.G.)**

... Respondents

(Cause Title taken from Case Information System)

For Petitioner	:	Ms. Ruchika Agrawal, Advocate
----------------	---	-------------------------------

For Respondents/State	:	Mr. Priyank Rathi, Govt. Advocate
-----------------------	---	-----------------------------------

Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice
Hon'ble Shri Ravindra Kumar Agrawal, Judge

Order on Board

Per Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

26/02/2026

1. This petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India has been filed
by the petitioner calling in question the action/inaction on the part of the



respondent authorities in continuing his name in the Gunda Badmash/Surveillance Register since 20.06.2014, without any fresh order or review, despite his acquittal in all the criminal cases registered against him and in spite of submission of representations dated 21.07.2020 and 18.01.2026 seeking deletion of his name from the said list.

2. The petitioner has filed the present petition seeking for the following reliefs:-

“(a) A writ and/or an order in the nature of appropriate writ do issue directing the Respondent authorities to delete the name of the Petitioner from the Gunda Badmash/Habitual Criminal List (which was recorded way back on 20.06.2014), in the interest of justice.

(b) In the alternate to above (a), a writ and/or an order in the nature of appropriate writ do issue directing the Respondent no. 4 & 5 to decide the representation dated 21.07.2020 (Annexure P-3) & 18.01.2026 (Annexure P-5), within a time frame fixed by this Hon'ble Court, in the interest of justice.

(c) Any other relief which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit in the facts & circumstances of case.”

3. The facts of the case as emerges from the pleadings of the petition are that, the petitioner has filed the present writ petition challenging the continued inclusion of his name in the Gunda Badmash/Surveillance Register maintained at Police Station Chakradhar Nagar, District



Raigarh, since 20.06.2014. It is the case of the petitioner that certain criminal cases were registered against him prior to the year 2014; however, he has been acquitted in all those cases by the competent criminal courts on different dates. According to him, no fresh criminal case has been registered against him after the year 2014.

In view of his acquittal and absence of any subsequent criminal antecedents, the petitioner submitted a representation dated 21.07.2020 before the police authorities seeking deletion of his name from the Gunda Badmash List. As no action was taken thereon, he sought information under the Right to Information Act and subsequently submitted another representation dated 18.01.2026 before the Superintendent of Police, Raigarh, reiterating his request for deletion of his name.

Despite the aforesaid representations, no decision has been communicated to the petitioner and his name continues to remain in the Surveillance Register. Aggrieved by the inaction of the respondent authorities and the continued recording of his name for more than eleven years without any fresh material or review, the petitioner has approached this Court by way of the present petition.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the continued inclusion of the petitioner's name in the Gunda Badmash/Surveillance Register since 20.06.2014 is wholly arbitrary, illegal and contrary to the provisions of the C.G. Police Regulations, particularly Regulation 855. It is contended that the petitioner has already been acquitted in all the



criminal cases registered against him and no fresh offence has been registered since the year 2014. In absence of any cogent material to demonstrate that the petitioner is a habitual offender or is determined to lead a life of crime, the continuation of surveillance for more than eleven years amounts to abuse of statutory power and infringes his fundamental rights under Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

Learned counsel thus prays that this Court may direct deletion of the petitioner's name from the Gunda Badmash List, or in the alternative, issue appropriate directions to the competent authority to decide the pending representations within a time-bound period.

5. Learned State counsel submits that the inclusion of the petitioner's name in the Surveillance/Gunda Badmash Register was made in accordance with the applicable provisions of the C.G. Police Regulations and on the basis of material then available with the police authorities. It is contended that the maintenance of such register is a preventive measure aimed at preservation of public order and that periodic review is undertaken by the competent authority. However, if the petitioner is aggrieved by the continuation of his name in the said register, he may avail the appropriate administrative remedy by submitting a fresh, detailed representation before the Superintendent of Police, Raigarh.
6. We have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material annexed with the petition.



7. In view of the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties and without entering into the merits of the controversy, this Court deems it appropriate to dispose of the present petition with liberty to the petitioner to submit a fresh, detailed representation before the Superintendent of Police, Raigarh, within a period of two weeks from today. In the event such representation is filed, the Superintendent of Police shall consider and decide the same in accordance with law, by passing a reasoned and speaking order, within a further period of four weeks thereafter.
8. With the aforesaid observations and directions, the petition stands **disposed of**.

Sd/-
(Ravindra Kumar Agrawal)
Judge

Sd/-
(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice

ved