



Serial No. 05
Daily List

HIGH COURT OF MEGHALAYA
AT SHILLONG

CrI.Petn. No. 60 of 2025

Date of order: 10.03.2026

1. Shri Bhum Bahadur Thapa @ Bhume Gaha Magar.

2. Smti A

...Petitioners

- versus -

1. The State of Meghalaya through Public Prosecutor.

2. Officer in charge, Laban Police Station, East Khasi Hills, Meghalaya.

....Respondents

Coram:

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

Appearance:

For the Petitioner : Mr R. Choudhury, Adv. with
Mr K.c. Choudhury, Adv.
Mr B. Barua, Adv.

For the Respondents : Mr A.H. Kharwanlang, Addl PP

JUDGMENT: (ORAL)

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

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

3. By this petition, the petitioner i.e., the petitioner No. 1 (accused) and the petitioner No. 2 (original complainant) seek



quashing of the FIR and consequently, the proceeding pending before the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Shillong, being No. 50 of 2017. Quashing is sought on the premise, that the parties i.e., the petitioner No. 1 and the petitioner No. 2 have amicably settled their dispute.

4. It is the prosecution case, that on 27th July, 2017, the petitioner No. 1 had gone to meet his friend, Shri Nar Bahadur Rana; that the petitioner No. 2 was alone at home; that the petitioner No. 1 finding his friend absent at home, asked the petitioner No. 2 to give him a glass of water; that when the petitioner No.1 went to hand over the empty glass back to the petitioner No. 2, he stumbled and fell on the petitioner, as a result of which the petitioner No. 2 filed an FIR, alleging an offence under Section 354 of the IPC as against the petitioner No. 1, for outraging her modesty.

5. The petitioner No. 2 has filed her affidavit. In the said affidavit, she has stated that the act of stumbling was an accidental one, which she misconstrued as outraging her modesty. The petitioner No. 2 has given her consent to quashing of the proceeding i.e., her “no objection” to quashing the case.



The petitioner No. 2 is present in person. When questioned, she reiterates what she has stated in the affidavit i.e., she has no objection to the quashing of the proceeding initiated by her as against the petitioner No. 1.

6. Considering the judgments of the Apex Court and what is stated aforesaid, there is no impediment if the petition is allowed. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the FIR, bearing No. 70(7)/17 registered with the Laban Police Station and consequently, the proceeding pending before the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Shillong, being No. 50 of 2017 are quashed and set aside.

7. Rules is made absolute on the aforesaid terms.

8. The petition is allowed and disposed of.

(Revati Mohite Dere)
Chief Justice