



**Serial No. 05**  
**Daily List**

**HIGH COURT OF MEGHALAYA**  
**AT SHILLONG**

Crl.Petn. No. 91 of 2026

Date of order: 29.07.2026

Dr Ravi Kant Mishra

**.....Petitioner**

**- versus -**

1. State of Meghalaya, represented by its Secretary, Home (Police) Department, Government of Meghalaya.
2. The Officer-In-charge, Mawlai Police Station, Shillong-793022, East Khasi Hills District, Meghalaya.
3. The Investigating Officer, Mawkynroh Police Outpost, Shillong-793022, East Khasi Hills District, Meghalaya.
4. Shri Kalyan Das, S/o Shri Shekhar Das, 10<sup>th</sup> Semester B.A.LL.B. student at Department of Law, North-Eastern Hill University, Shillong-793022, East Khasi Hills District, Meghalaya.
5. Shri Amit Mani Tripathi, S/o Shri Pramod Kumar Tripathi, 10<sup>th</sup> Semester B.A.LL.B. student at Department of Law, North-Eastern Hill University, Shillong-793022, East Khasi Hills District, Meghalaya.

**.....Respondents**

**Coram:**

**Hon'ble Mrs. Justice Revati Mohite Dere, Chief Justice**

**Appearance:**

For the Petitioner : Mr S. Sen, Adv. with  
Mr M.U. Ahmed, Adv.

For the Respondents : Mr A. Kumar, AG with  
Mr A.H. Kharwanlang, Addl Sr GA  
Mr P. Yobin, Adv. [R4&5]



- i) Whether approved for reporting in Law journals etc.: No
  - ii) Whether approved for publication in press: No
- 

**JUDGMENT: (Oral)**

Heard learned counsel for the respective parties.

2. Rule. Rule is made returnable forthwith with the consent of the parties and the aforesaid petitions are taken up for final disposal.

3. By this petition, the petitioner seeks quashing of the FIR dated 06.05.2026 registered with the Mawlai Police Station, being Mawlai P.S. Case No. 62(05)2026 and an alleged supplementary FIR of the same date i.e., 06.05.2026 again, registered with the Mawlai Police Station, being Mawlai P.S. Case No. 62(05) 2026 at the behest of the respondent Nos. 4 and 5 separately as against the petitioner for the alleged offence punishable under Section 126(2) of the BNS.

4. Quashing is sought on premise that the parties i.e., the petitioner and the respondent Nos. 4 and 5 have amicably settled their dispute. The respondent Nos. 4 and 5 have also filed



their respective affidavits giving their no objection to the quashing of the aforesaid FIRs registered at their behest. The complaint made by the respondent No. 4 is at page of the petition. The nature of both the complaints, pursuant to which the two FIRs were registered are identical. It appears that the In-Charge Officer of Mawkynroh Police Outpost, East Khasi Hills, Shillong received the said complaint and forwarded the same to the Officer-In-charge of Mawlai Police Station for registering ***“under appropriate section of law.”*** Infact, the contents of both the FIRs are identical.

5. Having perused the complaint, this Court finds that there is nothing in both the said complaints warranting registration of an FIR. This practice to direct registration of FIRs “under appropriate sections” is strongly deprecated. It is for the Police to first apply their mind, as to whether the complaint discloses the commission of any cognizable offence and only thereafter, after noting the sections, take appropriate decision thereon.

6. However, be that as it may, it is not necessary to go into the merits of the said complaints as the parties i.e., the petitioner and the respondent Nos. 4 and 5 have amicably



settled their dispute. The respondent Nos. 4 and 5 have filed identical affidavits. They have stated that the said FIRs were lodged by them owing to an emotional outburst emanating from various occasions which they perceived that the professor is against them; that the thoughts against the petitioner were their own misperceptions and assumptions, pursuant to which the said complaint was filed; that they do not nurture any ill-feelings against the professor in any manner; that having realised the same, they do not wish to pursue the complaint against the professor i.e., the petitioner. The respondent Nos. 4 and 5 have undertaken that they will not at any time in future file any form of complaint against the said professor in relating to the same issue or subject matter and that they will complete their law degree as obedient and dedicated students and leave the campus after obtaining the law degree. Both, the respondent Nos. 4 and 5 are present in Court. They reiterate what they have stated in the affidavit and state that they have no objection to the quashing of the FIR initiated at their behest.

7. Learned Advocate General also does not dispute the fact that the Police Officer could not have made such an



endorsement as made on the complaint i.e., registration of PE under “*appropriate sections of law*”. He does not dispute the fact that even if the complaint is perused, no offence whatsoever is disclosed and that the Police ought to have complied with the judgment of the Apex Court in ***Lalita Kumari v Government of U.P. & Ors.*** reported in ***(2014) 2 SCC 1***.

8. Be that as it may, without going into the merits, the fact remains that the parties have amicably settled their dispute. Since the parties i.e., the petitioner and the respondent Nos. 4 and 5, have amicably settled their dispute, the FIRs dated 06.05.2026 with the Mawlai Police Station at the instance of the respondent Nos. 4 and 5, are quashed and set aside,

9. Before parting, this Court deems it appropriate to observe, that the Police could not have registered the FIRs, having perused the contents of the complaints, much less register two FIRs based on the very same complaint made by respondent Nos. 4 and 5. Learned Advocate General to ensure that the Police do not repeat the same in future, inasmuch as, there cannot be two FIRs with respect to the same allegations. Appropriate directions to the Police be issued accordingly.



10. Having regard to the background and the circumstances in which complaints are being filed against the professors of the North Eastern Hill University (Law faculty), by respondent Nos. 4 and 5, any complaints made by the respondent Nos. 4 and 5, in future to be placed before the Superintendent of Police, East Khasi Hills District, Shillong and the Superintendent of Police, West Garo Hills, Tura, only thereafter, the said complaint be taken into its logical end. This order be circulated to the Superintendents of Police of the said Districts, to enable them to take note of the order.

11. The petition is allowed and Rule is made absolute on the aforesaid terms.

12. Petition is disposed of accordingly.

13. All parties to act on the authenticated copy of this order.

**(Revati Mohite Dere)**  
**Chief Justice**