



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

CRLMP No. 110 of 2026

Nandini Naik

.....

Petitioner

Ms. Arpita Nayak, Advocate

-versus-

1. State of Orissa

2. IIC, Bantala P.S.

.....

Opposite Parties

Mr. A.K. Apat, AGA

CORAM:

HON'BLE MISS JUSTICE SAVITRI RATHO

ORDER

27.02.2026

Order No.

05.

(Through hybrid mode)

1. Ms. Arpita Nayak, learned counsel for the Petitioner prays for an adjournment on behalf of Mr. Kashinath Pattnaik, learned counsel for the Petitioner stating that on account of some medical emergency, he has not been able to come to Court.
2. On 25.02.2026, the learned Additional Standing Counsel had made objection that the Petitioner has not followed the procedure under Section 174 of the BNSS as copy of the complaint has not been sent to the S.P. after the IIC allegedly refused to register the FIR. The mistake in the fresh date chart filed by the learned counsel for the Petitioner was noted, where it was mentioned therein that the Petitioner has sent a copy to the SP, Angul through Registered Post ultimately, the case was adjourned to today to enable Mr. R.B. Dash, learned Additional Standing Counsel to obtain instruction.
3. Ms. Arpita Nayak, learned counsel for the Petitioner has drawn attention of this Court to paragraph 8 of the CRLMP where it is stated that the IIC, Bantala P.S. is the President of the Bazar Committee of village Sankhapur for which he is supporting the villagers of Sankhapur and although he has registered P.S. Case No.



305 of 2025, no action has been taken against the accused persons.

4. Mr. A.K. Apat, learned Additional Government Advocate produces the instructions dated 25.02.2026 of the In-charge, IIC, Bantala P.S. where it is stated that after completion of the investigation in Bantala P.S. Case No. 305 of 2025, chargesheet dated 01.11.2025 under Sections 296/ 126 (2)/ 115 (2)/ 351 (3)/ 191 (2)/ 190 of the BNS read with Sections 3(1) (r) (s)/ 3 (2) (va) of the SC & ST POA have been submitted against (1) Naresh Dehury, (2) Bahu @ Debadatta Dehury, (3) Rama Chandra Pradhan, (4) Sadananda Dehury, (5) Sarat Chandra Dehury and (6) Bulu @ Manoj Pradhan of village Sankhapur, P.S.-Bantala, District-Angul.

5. From this, it is apparent that the apprehension as well as the allegation of the Petitioner in paragraph 8 of the CRLMP is baseless.

6. As it is apparent from the record that after submitting the complaint dated 02.11.2025 to the IIC, Bantala P.S., neither any representation nor complaint has been submitted to the SP, Angul, hence I am not inclined to entertain this CRLMP and issue any direction to the Opposite Party No.2 to register the FIR.

7. The CRLMP is accordingly dismissed.

8. There is, however, no bar for the Opposite Party No.2 to register a case, if he is satisfied that the complaint submitted before him discloses cognizable offences.

9. Urgent certified copy of this order be granted on proper application.

(Savitri Ratho)
Judge

puspa