



MAHARASHTRA STATE HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

9, Hajarimal Somani Marg, Opp. Chhatrapati Shivaji Terminus (VT), Mumbai - 400 001
Tel : 2207 3434 Fax : 2207 3434, 2209 2857 Website : <http://mahrc.maharashtra.gov.in>

SHRC/VGM/07/2010/ 1862

Date: 13 July 2010

Case No. -6537/2007-08

Name of the complainant : Bhikaji Shankar Patil
R/o. Gavashi (Patilwadi)
Tal Radhanagari, Dist Kolhapur

Vs.

The Superintendent of Police
Kolhapur (Rural)

Date : 24 June 2010

Coram : Justice V G Munshi, Member

ORDER

Read the averments made in the complaint and the report received from Respondent Superintendent of Police, Kolhapur. Read the case papers. Heard the parties.

2. Complainant Bhikaji Shankar Patil is resident of Village Gavasi Tal Radhanagari. His sister Draupada Shankar Patil (Deceased) also resided in the same village. That on 10.01.2008 dead body of Draupada Patil was found floating in river Dhamani. That on 10.01.2008 the complainant lodged report in Police Station Radhanagari that Rangrao Bhikaji Patil and five other persons



during period from 07.01.2008 to 10.01.2008 did commit murder of Draupada Patil. HC D D Patil visited the spot and did send the dead body for postmortem for examination. It was alleged by the complainant that on 11.01.2008 at about 3.00 p.m. in the noon, HC Patil and Police staff came to his house taken him to the spot of the incident and beaten him. He was taken ~~him~~ to the Police Station, he was kept in the lock up and he was released on 13.01.2008. It was alleged by the complainant that Police did not properly investigate the offence nor did record proper statement. Therefore, he moved the Commission for necessary action in this matter.

3. Respondent Superintendent of Police, Kolhapur by filing his report denied and disputed all the allegations of inaction. According to them offence at crime no. 8/2008 u/s ~~302~~ 302 of IPC was registered in Police Station against unknown persons. Later on PSI Shingte arrested Rangrao Patil and five other persons. The report further mentions that no sufficient evidence was found against ~~this~~ suspected persons. Therefore, Police made application to the Court for the discharge of the accused u/s. 169 Cr PC. In short according to the Respondent there was no substance into the allegations made in the complaint.

4. It was the grievance made by the complainant that Police did not make any proper investigation in this crime. Report of Superintendent of Police, Kolhapur shows that already instructions were given by him to PI Police Station Radhanagari and Dy Superintendent of Police, Shahuwadi Division to make detail investigation in this crime. Thus, even Superintendent of Police, Kolhapur also is of the opinion that inquiry afresh is necessary in this matter.

5. I am also of the opinion that inquiry afresh is necessary in this matter. I make following recommendations.

(A) Superintendent of Police, Kolhapur to make inquiry afresh in this matter through local crime branch as early as possible and take further action in this matter at early date.



R/R,HRG

(B) Copy of this order be sent to Superintendent of Police, Kolhapur through Secretary, State Human Rights Commission, Mumbai and compliance be reported.

With these observations and recommendations Case No. 6537/2007-08 is disposed of accordingly.

The Secretary to communicate this order to the parties concerned.



sd/-
(Justice V G Munshi)
Member, SHRC

✓