



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

CRLMP No. 272 of 2026

Victim

....

Petitioner

Mr. Arupananda Goswamy, Advocate
-versus-

- 1. State of Odisha**
- 2. The Superintendent of Police,
Puri**
- 3. IIC, Satyabadi Police Station,
Puri**

....

Opposite Parties

Mr. Saroj Kumar Rout,
Additional Standing Counsel

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MISS JUSTICE SAVITRI RATHO

ORDER
18.03.2026

Order No.
02.

(Through hybrid mode)

1. This CRLMP has been filed by the Petitioner with the prayer for direction to the Opposite Party No.3 to register the FIR as per the written report of the Petitioner dated 04.01.2026 under Annexure-1.

2. Since the FIR was not registered, the Petitioner had sent a representation to the S.P., Puri on 09.01.2026 through Speed Post and since no action was taken on the basis of the said letter, the Petitioner had appeared before the S.P. in his grievance cell on 20.01.2026 and on the said date, the S.P. had directed the IIC Satyabadi Police Station to enquire and take legal action. Copy of



the direction has been annexed as Annexure-3 series to the CRLMP. But, in spite of the said direction, since the IIC Satyabadi Police Station did not take any legal action, the Petitioner had approached this Court.

3. On 06.03.2026, the matter had been adjourned to enable the learned Additional Standing Counsel to obtain instructions. Today instructions dated 17.03.2026 of the IIC, Satyabadi Police Station is produced where it is stated that Satyabadi PS Case No.128 dated 13.03.2026 under Sections 296 / 126(2) / 115(2) / 74 / 75(2) / 78(2) / 332(c) / 351(2) / 351(3) / 3(5) of the BNS has been registered against one Bikram Pradhan and one Bipin Pradhan, both sons of one Sridhar Pradhan of Batulipada under Satyabadi Police Station, Puri.

4. Mr. Arupananda Goswamy, learned counsel for the Petitioner submits that as the accused persons are influential persons, they may continue to influence the IIC, Satyabadi Police Station who did not register any FIR on the complaint of the Petitioner or on the direction of the S.P. and case was registered only after instructions were sought for by this Court in the CRLMP.

5. Perusal of the FIR reveals that Sub-Inspector, B. Sethi has been directed to take up investigation in the case. Since the case has



been registered, normally, this Court would have disposed of the CRLMP without issuing any direction, but in view of the background of the case and the circumstances in which the case has been registered, the S.P.,Puri is directed to depute a Senior Officer of the rank of DSP / SDPO to supervise the investigation in this case.

6. It is found that in view of the nature of allegation in this case, the name of the Petitioner-informant should not have been reflected in the CRLMP or in the Annexures or orders of this Court. But in view of the negligence of the Officers manning the Filing Counter and the Stamp Reporter, the name of the Petitioner has not been redacted from the case records.

7. The name of the Petitioner is mentioned in the instructions of the IIC for which, her name is redacted from the instructions in Court today, before taking the instructions on record. The IO shall ensure that her identity is protected during investigation of the case.

8. The Registry is, therefore, directed to ensure that the name of the Petitioner is redacted from the physical and digital record as well as the orders of this Court in compliance of Standing Order No. 03 of 2024.



9. The CRLMP is disposed of with the aforesaid directions.

10. Office has pointed out that there is a typographical error in order dated 06.03.2026 where the case number has been inadvertently typed as 'CRLMP No.272 of 2025' in place of 'CRLMP No.272 of 2026'. The said error be corrected.

(Savitri Ratho)
Judge

RKS

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
Signed by: RANJAN KUMAR SETHI
Reason: Authentication
Location: ORISSA HIGH COURT
Date: 21-Mar-2026 10:59:43

