



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK
CRLMP No. 202 of 2026

Raghunath Patra

....

Petitioner

Mr. Byomakesh Tripathy, Advocate

-versus-

1. State of Odisha, represented by the

Secretary, Home Deptt., Bhubaneswar

2. The Superintendent of Police, Puri

3. The Inspector in-Charge,

Gadisagada Police Station

....

Opp. Parties

Mr. Saroj Kumar Rout,
Additional Standing Counsel

CORAM:

HON'BLE MISS JUSTICE SAVITRI RATHO

ORDER

26.02.2026

Order No.

(Through hybrid Mode)

- 03.
1. This CRLMP has been filed for a direction to the Opposite Party Nos. 2 and 3 to register the written information as FIR.
 2. It appears that the written information dated 13.07.2025 has been sent to the IIC, Gadisagada Police Station, Puri on 20.07.2025 by speed post. On the same day, the representation has been sent to the Superintendent of Police, Puri, by speed post.
 3. The synopsis of the case submitted by the learned counsel is as follows:-

"That the humble petitioner is petitioner therefore prays that this the Hon'ble Court may graciously be pleased to pass an order directing the Opp. Party No.2 and 3 to register the written information as F.I.R. And pass such other order (s) / direction (s) as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in facts and circumstance of the case"



4. This is the relief sought for in the case, for which it cannot be considered to be the synopsis.

5. Mr. Byomakesh Tripathy, learned counsel for the Petitioner submits that even though the allegations disclosed commission of cognizable offences, the IIC. Gadisagada Police Station did not register a case on 13.07.2025 or conduct a preliminary enquiry. The FIR was sent to the IIC as well as the S.P. Puri on 20.07.2025 by speed post.

6. It has been alleged that there is a dispute connected with demarcation of land. It is also stated that the accused persons did not sign on the demarcation report and Sobharani Patra tore her clothes and threatened to implicate the Petitioner in a false rape case. The accused used abusive language and *"took the Petitioner by iron rods and placed them on their roof after breaking his fence"*

7. In view of the nature of allegations in the case and of the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of ***Sudhir Bhaskarrao Tambe Vs. Hemant Yashwant Dhage: (2016) 6 SCC 277***, I am not inclined to exercise power under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to direct the Opposite Party No.3 to register a case.

8 It is open for the Petitioner to avail the alternate remedy, if so advised.

9. With this observation, the CRLMP is disposed of.

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

(Savitri Ratho)
Judge