

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****CRMP No. 730 of 2026****SURESH MISHRA *versus* STATE OF CHHATTISGARH****Order Sheet**

17.03.2026	Heard Mr. Diwesh Kumar, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Shaleen Singh Baghel, learned Government Advocate, appearing for the State/respondent No.1. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the present case arises out of a purely civil and revenue dispute relating to land bearing Khasra No. 404 situated at Village Mopka, Bilaspur, which was validly sold in the year 1999 by the original owner through the petitioner acting as Power of Attorney

holder, including 3000 sq. ft. in favour of Respondent No.2 by a duly registered sale deed followed by mutation in his favour. It is submitted that Respondent No.2 remained in peaceful possession for nearly 25 years and the dispute has surfaced only in 2024 during subsequent mutation proceedings on account of an alleged discrepancy in the Khasra number recorded in a certified copy of the sale deed.

It is further submitted that the said discrepancy has been wrongly given a criminal colour by lodging the impugned FIR in 2025 under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B IPC after an inordinate and unexplained delay of over two decades. The petitioner neither derived any benefit nor had any motive to manipulate the Khasra number, and the issue, at best, pertains to correction of revenue entries for which appropriate civil and revenue remedies are available. Thus, no prima facie criminal offence is made out and continuation of the proceedings amounts to an abuse of the process of law.

On the other hand, learned counsel for the State submits that the allegations in the impugned FIR disclose commission of cognizable offences under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B IPC, inasmuch as manipulation of the Khasra number in the sale deed has resulted in wrongful mutation and corresponding loss to the complainant. It is submitted that the delay in lodging the FIR is sufficiently explained as the discrepancy came to light only during subsequent mutation proceedings in 2024, and at this stage, the matter requires thorough investigation, warranting no interference by this Court.

In view of the above, issue notice to the respondents by ordinary process as well as speed post.

Learned State counsel appears and accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1, therefore, issuance of notice to the State/respondents No.1, is dispensed with.

Issue notice to respondent No.2 by ordinary and

speed post. Process fee be paid as per Rules.

Four weeks' time is granted to the learned counsel for the respondents to file their reply-affidavits and thereafter, two week's time is granted to the learned counsel for the petitioner to file rejoinder-affidavit.

List the matter thereafter.

Sd/-
(Ravindra Kumar Agrawal)
Judge

Sd/-
(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice