



2026:CGHC:2920-DB



2026:CGHC:2920-DB

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**CRMP No. 191 of 2026**

1 - Shashi Lata Waghe W/o Deceased Arun Prakash Waghe Aged About 72 Years R/o Akash Sadan, Near Gopal Store, Rajatalab, Post Raipur, P.S. Civil Lines, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

2 - Nilama Robbins W/o Vijay Kumar Robbins Aged About 61 Years R/o M I G 1-840, Amdi Nagar, Ward 56 Hudco, Bhilai West, P.S. City Kotwali Bhilai, District Durg, Chhattisgarh.

3 - M. Jagannath Rao S/o S.L.R. Rao Aged About 72 Years R/o House No. 1630, Shivanand Nagar, Sector 2, Street 4, Ward No. 8, Gudhiyari, P.S. Khamtarai, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

4 - Anwar Ali S/o Irshad Ali Aged About 67 Years R/o 26/766, Near Pujari School, Rajatalab, P.S. Civil Lines, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

5 - Ajay John S/o Anil Kumar John Aged About 47 Years R/o 1039, Gitti Khadan Road, Katora Talab, Dayanand Nagar, P.S. Civil Lines, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

6 - Akanksha Nand W/o Akhilesh Nand Aged About 44 Years R/o Flat No. 204, Block D-2-B Golden Tower, Near Pani Tanki, Ward No. 46, Amlidih, Ravigram, P.S. Azad Chowk, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

7 - Virendra Kumar Singh S/o Mahendra Pratap Singh Aged About 62 Years R/o Saint Pauls Church Compound, Near Subhash Stadium, P.S. Civil Lines District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.



8 - Morrison George S/o Harison George Aged About 23 Years R/o 5/785 Sohan Mohan Building, Shri Nagar Khamtarai, Khamtarai-2, P.S. Khamtarai, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

9 - Vaibhav Ephraim S/o Badal Ephraim Aged About 39 Years R/o Rawatpura Colony, Phase-1, Behind Kajal Kirana Store, Bhatagaon, P.S. Tikrapara, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

10 - Ajay Martin S/o Sant Kumar Martin Aged About 58 Years R/o Rajkumar College Road, Saint Mathews Church, P.S. Civil Lines, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

11 - Atul Anurag Arthur S/o Nirmal Arthur Aged About 51 Years R/o Suman Niketan, Jogi Dongri, Pendra Road, P.S. Gaurela, District Gaurela-Pendra-Marwahi (Gpm), Chhattisgarh.

12 - Sapna George W/o Harrison George Aged About 56 Years R/o 5/785, Sohan Mohan Building, Shri Nagar Khamtarai, Khamtarai-2, P.S. Khamtarai, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

... Petitioner(s)

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Station Civil Lines, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

2 - Preeti Yadav W/o Sohan Lal Yadav Aged About 38 Years R/o Chhattisgarh Nagar, Tikrapara, P.S. Tikrapara, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

... Respondent(s)

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Kishore Narayan, Advocate

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Saumya Rai, Dy. G.A.

Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

Hon'ble Ravindra Kumar Agrawal, Judge

Judgment on Board



Per Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

19.01.2026

1. Heard Mr. Kishore Narayan, learned counsel for the petitioner.
Also heard Mr. Saumya Rai, learned Deputy Government Advocate for the respondent No.1 / State.

2. The petitioner has filed this petition with following prayer:

“(1) Quash F.I.R dated 17.10.2025 in Crime No. 0520/2025 registered at Police Station Civil Lines, District - Raipur (C.G.), u/s 296, 115(2), 351(2), 191(2) of Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 in relation to the present petitioners (Annexure P/1).

(2) Pass any other order in view of the special facts and circumstances mentioned in the present petition, in the interest of justice.”

3. As per the prosecution case, on the basis of a complaint lodged by the complainant, a resident of Tikrapara, District Raipur, presently working as a teacher at Shalem English School, Raipur, it is alleged that on 17.10.2025 between 5:30 p.m. and 6:00 p.m., the accused persons namely Shashi Waghe, Sapna George, Anwar Ali, Nilima Robbins, Morrison George, Vaibhav Ephraim and others unlawfully entered the premises of Shalem English School without permission, whereupon they behaved in a rude and aggressive manner, abused the complainant and other staff members in filthy and obscene language, threatened to kill them, and assaulted them by slapping. It is further alleged that the accused persons tampered with school documents and extended



threats that if any document was found missing, the complainant would be falsely implicated and punished, and despite objections, they continued to intimidate and threaten the complainant by saying “do whatever you want,” causing mental distress and apprehension of danger to life and property, on the basis of which offences under Sections 296, 115(2), 351(2) and 191(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 were found prima facie made out and Crime No. 0520/2025 dated 17.10.2025 was registered at Police Station Civil Lines, Raipur, Chhattisgarh, for investigation.

4. Leaned counsel for the petitioner submits that the impugned F.I.R. is a clear counterblast and an abuse of the criminal process, inasmuch as the petitioners had already lodged a prior F.I.R. on 17.10.2025 in respect of the same incident, alleging that the private respondents along with their associates forcibly trespassed into the premises of Salem English School between 5:30 p.m. and 6:00 p.m., abused the petitioners in filthy and obscene language, threatened them with death, brutally assaulted the complainant by throwing him to the ground, beating him with fists and a sharp object, snatching his walking stick, causing injuries on his legs and face, breaking his mobile phone and spectacles, robbing him of money, and even extending threats of murder if he returned to the school, besides assaulting and intimidating an advocate present at the spot, thereby compelling registration of offences, and significantly, the crime number itself



demonstrates that the petitioners' F.I.R. preceded the F.I.R.

lodged by the complainant against them; it is further submitted that the parties have a long-standing dispute wherein the petitioners had earlier lodged an F.I.R. against the respondents for cheating and forgery for falsely projecting themselves as office bearers of the Chhattisgarh Diocese Board of Education using forged letterheads and documents, leading to registration of offences under Sections 420, 467, 468 and 471 read with 34 IPC, which allegations stood corroborated by official records issued under Section 27 of the Act. Further, the Registrar, Firms and Societies, by a reasoned order dated 29.09.2025, categorically held that actions taken pursuant to an invalid executive committee were unsustainable, directed that suspensions and disciplinary actions be kept in abeyance, cancelled the expired executive committee list, and ordered fresh elections strictly as per the bye-laws, which order was subsequently upheld in second appeal by the Secretary, Department of Commerce & Industries on 01.12.2025, conclusively establishing that the dispute is purely managerial and election-related in nature with statutory remedies available. On the date of the alleged incident, the petitioners constituted the valid executive body and were lawfully discharging their duties, whereas the respondents were rank trespassers who came armed, assaulted the petitioners, and thereafter lodged a false and retaliatory F.I.R. to shield their own criminal acts. Some petitioners were not even present at the spot and were either at



their residences or attending proceedings before the Department of Commerce & Industries, yet they have been falsely implicated; that after the incident, the private respondents brazenly circulated WhatsApp messages boasting that they had taught the petitioners a lesson, which conduct, coupled with their prior involvement in offences under Sections 296 and 351 IPC/BNS, clearly demonstrates a pattern of violent and intimidating behavior, and therefore, the continuation of the impugned criminal proceedings is wholly malicious, vexatious, and liable to be quashed in the interest of justice.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the petitioner and submits that the impugned F.I.R. and the consequential criminal proceedings are lawful and justified, having been registered on the basis of a cognizable offence disclosed from the complaint and the statements collected during preliminary inquiry, and that the allegations clearly prima facie constitute offences under the relevant provisions of the BNS, 2023. It is further submitted that the existence of a counter F.I.R. or prior disputes between the parties does not, by itself, vitiate the registration of the present crime, as both versions of the incident are required to be independently investigated in accordance with law. The plea raised by the petitioners regarding management disputes, validity of the executive committee, or orders passed by the Registrar,



Firms and Societies, involves disputed questions of fact which cannot be adjudicated in proceedings under Section 482 Cr.P.C./Article 226 of the Constitution and are matters to be examined during trial. Further, the allegations of unlawful entry, abuse, criminal intimidation, assault, and tampering with documents pertain to acts of violence and public order and cannot be brushed aside as a purely civil or managerial dispute. The investigation is still at a nascent stage, material witnesses are yet to be examined, documentary and electronic evidence is yet to be collected, and at this stage any interference by this Court would seriously prejudice a fair and complete investigation, therefore, the petition seeking quashing of the F.I.R. and proceedings is premature, misconceived, and liable to be dismissed in the interest of justice and public order.

6. Further, a bare perusal of the F.I.R. goes to show that the allegations made therein are vague, omnibus and inherently improbable, inasmuch as no specific overt act, role or attribution has been assigned to the individual petitioners, and the complaint proceeds on sweeping and generalized assertions without disclosing the essential ingredients of the alleged offences. The F.I.R. conspicuously fails to explain the delay, sequence of events, or the presence and participation of several petitioners who were admittedly not present at the place of occurrence, thereby exposing material contradictions and embellishments. The narrative appears to be a verbatim reproduction of the petitioners'



earlier complaint with improvements, clearly indicating that the impugned F.I.R. has been lodged as a counterblast with an oblique motive to pressurize the petitioners and to give a criminal colour to a predominantly management and election-related dispute and thus, on the face of the record itself, the continuation of the impugned criminal proceedings would amount to an abuse of the process of law and would result in miscarriage of justice.

7. We have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the documents appended with petition.
8. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, the nature of allegations levelled in the impugned F.I.R., and the submissions advanced by the learned counsel for the parties, this Court is of the considered opinion that the complaint discloses prima facie commission of cognizable offences warranting a full-fledged investigation. The existence of a counter F.I.R., the rival claims regarding management and validity of the executive committee, and the defence sought to be raised by the petitioners involve disputed questions of fact which cannot be adjudicated in exercise of inherent or writ jurisdiction. At this stage, this Court cannot undertake a meticulous examination of the evidence or determine the truthfulness of the allegations, and any interference would amount to stifling a legitimate prosecution. The case does not fall within the parameters laid down for quashing of criminal proceedings, nor is it shown that the impugned action is



2026:CGHC:2920-DB

manifestly malicious or an abuse of the process of law.

9. Accordingly, this Court finds no merit in the petition, and the same is liable to be and is hereby **dismissed**.

Sd/-
(Ravindra Kumar Agrawal)
Judge

Sd/-
(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice

Manpreet