



CGHC010142292024

2026:CGHC:37070-DB

NAFR

BABLU
RAJENDRA
BHANARKAR
Digitally signed by
BABLU RAJENDRA
BHANARKAR
Date: 2026.08.22
10:37:48 +0530

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

CRMP No. 1533 of 2024

1 - Atul Rathore S/o Shri Mahendra Rathore Aged About 35 Years R/o Sainagar, Uslapur, Bilaspur, District - Bilaspur (C.G.)

2 – XYZ

3 - Nitesh Lahre S/o Hiraram Lahre Aged About 37 Years R/o Sainagar, Uslapur, Bilaspur, District - Bilaspur (C.G.)

4 - Abhishek Rathore S/o Shri Mahendra Rathore Aged About 36 Years R/o Sant Marg, Gandhi Nagar, Indore (M.P.)

... Petitioner(s)

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of Home (Police), Mahanadi Bhawan, Capital Complex, Mantralay, Atal Nagar, Nawa Raipur, District - Raipur Chhattisgarh.

2 - Director General Of Police Police Head Quarters (Phq), Raipur, District - Raipur (C.G.)

3 - Arvind Kujur Indian Police Service Officer, Currently Posted As Commandant, 3rd Battalion, Amleshwar, Durg (C.G.)

4 - The Station House Officer Police Station - Maudhapara, District Raipur (C.G.)

5 - The Station House Officer Police Station - Kumhari, District Durg (C.G.)

6 - The Station House Officer Police Station - Bhilai 3 (Old Bhilai), District Durg (C.G.)

7 - The Station House Officer Police Station Jarhagaon, District - Mungeli (C.G.)

8 - The Station House Officer Police Station - City Kotwali, District Mungeli (C.G.)

9 - The Station House Officer Police Station - City Kotwali, District Bemetara (C.G.)

10 - Piyush Tiwari S/o Basant Tiwari Aged About 33 Years R/o New Colony, Tikrapara, Police Station - Tikrapara, District - Raipur (C.G.)

11 - Abhishek Gajalwar S/o Lt. Deepak Gajalwar Aged About 30 Years R/o New Colony, Tikrapara, Police Station - Tikrapara, District - Raipur (C.G.)

... Respondent(s)

For Petitioner(s) : Mr.Aman Saxena, Advocate

For Respondents : Mr.Ashish Shukla, Additional Advocate

No. 1, 2 and 4 to 9 General

For Respondent : Ms.Smriti Ekka, Advocate

No.3

For Respondent : Mr.Raza Ali, Advocate

No.10

For Respondent : Mr.K.N.Singh, Advocate

No.11

Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

Hon'ble Shri Ravindra Kumar Agrawal, Judge

Order on Board

Per Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

19.08.2026

1. Heard Mr.Aman Saxena, learned counsel for the petitioners as well as Mr.Ashish Shukla, learned Additional Advocate General appearing for respondents No.1, 2 and 4 to 9, Ms.Smriti Ekka, learned counsel appearing for respondent No.3, Mr.Raza Ali,

learned counsel appearing for respondent No.10 and Mr.K.N.Singh, learned counsel appearing for respondent No.11.

2. By way of this petition under Section 482 CrPC the petitioners have prayed for following relief:-

“1. It is, therefore, prayed that this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to call for the entire records relating of the petitioners for its kind perusal. the case

2. That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to quash the Impugned Order of framing charges passed in Crime No. 58/2021 that is falsely registered against the petitioners annexed herewith as Annexure P/1.

3. That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to quash the entire criminal proceedings including chargesheet No. 77/2021 along with supplementary chargesheet No. 77-A/2022 and initiated against the petitioners arising from FIR No. 58/2021 dated 27.02.2021 annexed herewith as Annexures P/2 (Colly.) as being malafide and abuse of the process of law.

4. That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to direct the respondent no. 1 and 2 to conduct disciplinary enquiry against respondent 3 as per applicable law for malicious abuse of law and weaponizing it against innocent citizens and take action to set up example for the rest of the police force which abuses the law.

5. That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to direct the respondent authorities to compensate the petitioners as well as award costs of litigation as the present false and fabricated report has been lodged by

the police officers against them, due to which they are facing mental and physical harassment.

6. That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to grant any other relief/reliefs in favour of the petitioners, which the Hon'ble Court deemed fit & just in the facts and circumstances of the case, including awarding of the costs to the petitioners."

3. The case of the petitioners, in substance, is that the present prosecution is one amongst a series of criminal cases instituted against petitioner No.2, Priyanka Lahre, her husband-petitioner No.1 Atul Rathore and other members of their family, arising out of a personal dispute between petitioner No.2 and respondent No.10-Piyush Tiwari. According to the petitioners, petitioner No.2 came into contact with respondent No.10 in the year 2017. Respondent No.10 represented himself as an unmarried police officer and proposed marriage to petitioner No.2. A relationship thereafter developed between them. Subsequently, petitioner No.2 came to know that respondent No.10 was already married and, when she sought that he should honour his representation regarding marriage, he refused to do so. Petitioner No.2 thereafter ended the relationship and subsequently married petitioner No.1.
4. The petitioners submit that after petitioner No.2's marriage, respondent No.10 insisted that she should continue the relationship with him and threatened her with disclosure/circulation of private photographs if she did not accede to his demands. When petitioner No.2 refused, respondent No.10

initiated criminal proceedings against her and her family members. The first such proceeding was Crime No.107/2019 registered at Police Station Moudhapara, Raipur. Thereafter, according to the petitioners, a series of criminal cases came to be registered against substantially the same persons in Raipur, Durg, Mungeli and Bemetara.

5. The petitioners have placed the entire course of events before this Court to contend that the present Crime No.58/2021 cannot be viewed as an isolated prosecution. According to them, Crime No.192/2019 was registered at Police Station Kumhari, District Durg, Crime No.412/2020 was registered at Police Station Old Bhilai, District Durg, and thereafter several cases came to be registered in District Mungeli, including Crime No.14/2021, Crime No.58/2021, Crime No.243/2021 and Crime No.328/2021. In a number of these proceedings, the complainants were respondent No.10 himself or persons closely connected with him.
6. The petitioners submit that Crime No.58/2021 was registered at Police Station Jarhagaon, District Mungeli, on 27.02.2021. The complainant in the said case is respondent No.11-Abhishek Gajalwar, who is stated to be the driver of respondent No.10-Piyush Tiwari. The accused persons include petitioner No.2 and substantially the same members of her family who had already been implicated in the earlier proceedings. The prosecution alleges commission of offences punishable under Sections 420,

467, 468, 120-B and 212 of the Indian Penal Code, essentially relating to alleged fraudulent transactions and promises concerning government employment.

7. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the present prosecution is a continuation of the same malicious campaign which commenced after petitioner No.2 refused to continue her relationship with respondent No.10 and married petitioner No.1. It is argued that respondent No.11, being the driver of respondent No.10, cannot be treated as an independent complainant in the peculiar factual background of the case, particularly when the same family members were repeatedly implicated in successive criminal proceedings. Learned counsel further submits that the sequence of criminal cases is itself significant. The first proceedings were initiated by respondent No.10 and, thereafter, when proceedings were instituted in Mungeli, complainants included persons closely associated with him. The same persons were repeatedly arrayed as accused. According to learned counsel, the repeated registration of FIRs, repeated arrests and the manner in which the petitioners and their family members were subjected to criminal proceedings disclose a continuing attempt to keep them under pressure and to frustrate their liberty.
8. Learned counsel submits that in the connected proceedings the petitioners had earlier approached this Court in W.P. No.793/2022, challenging the entire series of criminal cases. This Court, while

not examining the merits of the individual prosecutions in a composite proceeding, granted liberty to the petitioners to challenge the individual criminal proceedings separately. Pursuant to the said liberty, the present petition has been filed specifically challenging Crime No.58/2021. Learned counsel further submits that the subsequent inquiry conducted by the police authorities assumes exceptional significance. On complaints made by the petitioners and their family members, the Director General of Police, Chhattisgarh, directed constitution of a Special Investigation Team. The SIT conducted an inquiry into the series of criminal cases registered against the petitioners.

9. Learned counsel submits that the SIT report dated 30.06.2024 and the consequential report of the Inspector General of Police, Raipur Range, are not documents created by the petitioners. They emanate from the police authorities themselves and have been placed on record by the State through the affidavit filed in the connected proceedings. According to the said material, the eight criminal cases registered against the petitioners were found to be fabricated and the complicity of respondent No.3-Arvind Kujur, the then Superintendent of Police, was recorded in relation to the registration of the offences against the petitioners in the concerned districts. Learned counsel submits that the subsequent official findings are of particular relevance because the allegation of misuse of police machinery is no longer based merely upon an assertion made by the accused persons. The State's own affidavit

records the findings of the SIT and the subsequent administrative action taken against the concerned police officers.

10. Learned counsel also submits that, in the connected Crime No.107/2019, the SIT specifically found negligence on the part of the Investigating Officer and disciplinary proceedings were directed against him. Likewise, the State's affidavit records that disciplinary proceedings were recommended against respondent No.3-Arvind Kujur. Learned counsel submits that these developments materially affect the bona fides of the criminal proceedings forming part of the same series. Learned counsel further submits that several connected proceedings have either resulted in closure reports or have been stayed by this Court. Crime No.192/2019 and Crime No.412/2020 resulted in closure reports; proceedings arising from Crime No.107/2019, Crime No.14/2021 and Crime No.243/2021 have been stayed by this Court; and Crime No.328/2021 has also resulted in a closure report. According to learned counsel, while each such development may not individually establish falsity of the present FIR, the cumulative effect assumes considerable importance in determining whether the present prosecution forms part of a larger abuse of criminal machinery.

11. Learned counsel submits that the official postings of respondent No.3 also form part of the surrounding circumstances. It is contended that a substantial number of the cases came to be

registered in districts where respondent No.3 was posted in senior police positions during the relevant period. Learned counsel fairly submits that the mere coincidence of posting and registration of an FIR cannot establish mala fide, but contends that such circumstance acquires significance when viewed together with the subsequent SIT findings recording complicity of respondent No.3. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioners were subjected to repeated arrests in the connected criminal proceedings and, in some cases, arrests were shown to have been made from jail. According to the petitioners, the practical consequence was that whenever they obtained bail in one case, they were sought to be arrested in another case, thereby frustrating the benefit of the bail orders and keeping them continuously embroiled in criminal proceedings. Learned counsel submits that the present case therefore squarely falls within the principles laid down by the Supreme Court in **State of Haryana v. Bhajan Lal, 1992 Supp (1) SCC 335**, particularly the category where a criminal proceeding is manifestly attended with mala fide and/or where the proceeding is maliciously instituted with an ulterior motive for wreaking vengeance due to private or personal grudge.

12. It is further submitted that this Court is not required to conduct a mini-trial or determine the truth of each allegation contained in the FIR. The submission is that the Court is required only to examine whether, in view of the subsequent official findings and the

peculiar surrounding circumstances, continuation of the prosecution would amount to abuse of the process of law.

- 13.** Per contra, learned counsel appearing for respondent No.11- Abhishek Gajalwar has opposed the petition and submitted that the allegations of mala fide, personal vengeance and misuse of police machinery are wholly denied. It is submitted that the present FIR was lodged by respondent No.11 in his own capacity and merely because he was employed as a driver of respondent No.10, it cannot be presumed that the complaint was lodged at the instance of respondent No.10. Learned counsel for respondent No.11 submits that the petitioners are attempting to create a common thread between several distinct criminal cases merely because some of the accused persons are common. The fact that different FIRs were registered against some of the same persons cannot, by itself, establish that all such proceedings were fabricated or that they were part of a concerted design.
- 14.** Learned counsel submits that each FIR has to be examined on its own allegations and on the material collected during investigation. The present case cannot be quashed merely by referring to the circumstances of other criminal proceedings. The fact that respondent No.11 was known to respondent No.10 or was working as his driver does not establish that he acted as his proxy or that he lodged a false complaint at his instance. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioners have not produced any

direct, independent or legally sustainable material demonstrating that respondent No.10 instructed, instigated, procured, financed or otherwise controlled respondent No.11 in lodging the present FIR. In the absence of such material, the allegation of collusion is only an inference and cannot furnish a ground for quashing the prosecution. Learned counsel also submits that the repeated implication of the same accused persons does not establish mala fide. If the same persons were alleged to have committed different offences, their names could legitimately occur in more than one FIR. Likewise, the chronology of registration of the cases cannot, by itself, be converted into proof of malicious prosecution.

15. With regard to the allegations concerning repeated arrests and arrests from jail, learned counsel submits that an accused already in custody in one case may, subject to law, be arrested in another case in which his involvement is alleged. Such subsequent arrest cannot automatically be characterized as an abuse of the arrest process. Learned counsel submits that the official postings of respondent No.3-Arvind Kujur also do not establish any nexus between respondent No.10, respondent No.11 and the alleged misuse of police machinery. The mere fact that an officer was posted in a particular district when an FIR was registered cannot lead to an inference that the FIR was engineered by him.

16. Learned counsel has also challenged reliance upon the SIT report. It is submitted that respondent No.11 was not afforded an

effective opportunity of participating in the SIT inquiry and placing his version before the authorities. Therefore, the findings recorded by the SIT cannot be treated as a final or binding adjudication against respondent No.11 or as conclusive proof that the present FIR was false. It is further submitted that the SIT report cannot retrospectively invalidate a criminal case in which investigation has been completed and charge-sheet has been filed. According to learned counsel, the evidentiary value and correctness of the SIT findings are matters which cannot be conclusively determined in proceedings under Section 482 CrPC.

17. Learned counsel further submits that the closure reports filed in some connected cases and the stay orders passed in others cannot establish that the allegations in the present case are false. A closure report is confined to the particular case in which it is filed, while an order of stay is an interim order and cannot be treated as a finding on the merits. It is thus submitted that the petitioners are essentially seeking appreciation of disputed facts and evaluation of the evidence, which is impermissible in exercise of the limited jurisdiction under Section 482 CrPC. The petition, according to learned counsel, deserves to be dismissed.

18. We have heard learned counsel for the parties, considered the rival submissions and perused the pleadings and documents placed on record.

19. Before considering the individual allegations forming the subject matter of Crime No.58/2021, it would be appropriate to notice the factual background and the subsequent official developments, particularly because the present prosecution forms part of the same series of proceedings which were considered by this Court in CRMP No.1512/2024 arising out of Crime No.107/2019.
20. In the connected proceedings, an Additional Superintendent of Police (Rural), Raipur, who was also the Officer-in-Charge of the case, filed a personal affidavit dated 08.08.2024. The material portion of the affidavit records that, pursuant to complaints made by Sushila Rathore and others, the Director General of Police, Chhattisgarh, directed constitution of a Special Investigation Team; that the SIT conducted a detailed inquiry into each of the offences registered against the petitioners; and that, on 30.06.2024, the Inspector General of Police, Raipur Range, submitted a summary to the Director General of Police, Chhattisgarh recording that all eight offences registered against the petitioners were fabricated and also recording complicity of respondent No.3-Arvind Kujur in the episode concerning registration of offences against the petitioners in Districts Mungeli and Bemetara.
21. The said affidavit further records, in relation to Crime No.107/2019, that the SIT found the Investigating Officer to have acted negligently and, pursuant to the directions of the Inspector

General of Police, Raipur Range dated 29.06.2024, disciplinary proceedings were directed against the concerned Investigating Officer. The affidavit further records that, out of the eight offences registered against the petitioners, closure reports had been submitted in Crime No.740/2021 of Bemetara, Crime No.328/2021 of Mungeli and Crime No.412/2020 of Old Bhilai, Durg, while Crime No.192/2019 of Police Station Kumhari was in the process of submission of closure report. It also records that, in Crime No.243/2021, the SIT found negligence in investigation and departmental enquiry was ordered against the concerned Investigating Officer. Significantly, the affidavit records that the Director General of Police, Chhattisgarh, made a report to the State Government for institution of disciplinary proceedings against respondent No.3-Arvind Kujur vide letter dated 08.07.2024. The aforesaid affidavit was filed by the State through its responsible police officer and, therefore, the Court is not called upon merely to accept an allegation made by the petitioners that the criminal proceedings were fabricated. There is subsequent official material placed on record by the State itself which records serious findings concerning the manner in which the series of criminal cases came to be registered and investigated.

22. In the present case, Crime No.58/2021 is one of the very eight criminal cases which were subjected to the SIT inquiry. The present FIR was registered at Police Station Jarhagaon, District Mungeli, on 27.02.2021. The complainant is respondent No.11-

Abhishek Gajalwar, who is stated to be the driver of respondent No.10-Piyush Tiwari. The accused persons substantially overlap with those implicated in the other cases forming part of the same series.

23. We are conscious of the submission of learned counsel for respondent No.11 that the mere fact that a complainant is a driver, friend, relative or associate of another person does not, by itself, establish that he is acting as a proxy. We entirely agree with the said proposition. The relationship between the complainant and respondent No.10, considered in isolation, cannot establish mala fide or falsity of the FIR. However, the petitioners do not rely upon this circumstance in isolation. The relevant question is whether the present prosecution, when viewed in the context of the entire factual background and the subsequent official inquiry, can legitimately be permitted to continue.

24. The record discloses a sequence in which Crime No.107/2019 was initially registered at the instance of respondent No.10, followed by other criminal cases in which substantially the same members of the petitioners' family were repeatedly implicated. In the subsequent cases, the complainants included persons connected with respondent No.10, including his driver. The present case is therefore required to be considered against this larger background.

25. We also take note of the fact that several connected criminal proceedings subsequently resulted in closure reports, while proceedings in other cases were stayed by this Court. We are conscious that a closure report in one case does not automatically establish that another FIR is false and that an order of stay cannot be treated as a final adjudication on merits. These circumstances, therefore, are not being treated as conclusive proof of innocence.
26. Nevertheless, the cumulative effect of the repeated criminal proceedings, the repeated implication of substantially the same family members, the relationship between the successive complainants and respondent No.10, the subsequent status of several cases, and, most importantly, the findings recorded by the SIT and placed before this Court by the State itself, cannot be ignored.
27. The State's own affidavit records that the SIT found all eight offences registered against the petitioners to be fabricated and recorded complicity of respondent No.3-Arvind Kujur in the episode concerning registration of the offences. It further records that the Director General of Police recommended disciplinary proceedings against respondent No.3.
28. The relevance of the aforesaid material is not that the SIT report should be treated as a judicial determination binding upon the parties. It is not. Nor is this Court recording any finding of criminal liability against respondent No.11 on the basis of the SIT report.

The relevance is that a subsequent official inquiry, constituted by the police authorities themselves, examined the very series of criminal proceedings forming the factual background of the present case and recorded findings seriously adverse to the manner in which those proceedings had been initiated.

- 29.** The objection that the SIT inquiry did not afford respondent No.11 a full adjudicatory opportunity also does not, in the peculiar circumstances of the present case, make the report wholly irrelevant. We are not treating the report as a binding adjudication against respondent No.11. We are considering it as subsequent official material which, together with the other circumstances emerging from the record, bears directly upon the question whether continuation of the prosecution would amount to abuse of process.
- 30.** The Court is equally conscious that the jurisdiction under Section 482 CrPC is extraordinary and is to be exercised sparingly, cautiously and in the interest of justice. Ordinarily, the High Court does not undertake a detailed appreciation of evidence, adjudicate disputed questions of fact or conduct a mini-trial.
- 31.** At the same time, the inherent jurisdiction is intended to prevent abuse of the process of any Court and to secure the ends of justice. The mere fact that a charge-sheet has been filed does not create an absolute bar against exercise of inherent jurisdiction where subsequent material of substantial and official character

demonstrates that continuation of the prosecution would itself result in manifest injustice.

32. The principles governing the exercise of such jurisdiction stand settled by the Supreme Court in **Bhajan Lal** (supra). One of the illustrative categories recognized therein covers cases where a criminal proceeding is manifestly attended with mala fide and/or where the proceeding is maliciously instituted with an ulterior motive for wreaking vengeance due to private or personal grudge.
33. The present case has to be examined in the light of the aforesaid principle. No single circumstance, considered independently, may be sufficient to quash the proceedings. The Court is required to consider the cumulative effect of the circumstances emerging from the record.
34. The relevant circumstances which emerge in the present case are:

- i. Crime No.58/2021 forms part of a series of criminal proceedings registered against the petitioners and their family members between 2019 and 2021;
- ii. substantially the same persons were repeatedly implicated in the successive criminal proceedings;
- iii. respondent No.10-Piyush Tiwari was the complainant in several of the connected cases, while in subsequent cases the complainants included persons closely connected with him;

iv. respondent No.11, the complainant in Crime No.58/2021, is stated to have been the driver of respondent No.10;

v. the petitioners and their family members were subjected to repeated criminal proceedings and arrests over a considerable period;

vi. several of the connected proceedings subsequently culminated in closure reports, while proceedings in certain other cases were stayed by this Court;

vii. the police authorities themselves constituted an SIT to inquire into the series of criminal cases;

viii. the State's own affidavit records that, on the basis of the SIT inquiry, all eight offences were found to be fabricated;

ix. the SIT recorded complicity of respondent No.3- Arvind Kujur in the episode concerning registration of the offences;

x. the SIT found negligence in investigation in connected proceedings, including Crime No.107/2019, and disciplinary proceedings were directed against the concerned Investigating Officer; and

xi. the Director General of Police, Chhattisgarh, recommended institution of disciplinary proceedings against respondent No.3.

35. The Court reiterates that none of these circumstances, standing alone, would necessarily justify quashing of a criminal prosecution. It is their cumulative effect, particularly in the backdrop of the subsequent official inquiry conducted by the

police authorities themselves, which assumes decisive significance.

36. The present case is also distinguishable from an ordinary petition under Section 482 CrPC where an accused merely disputes the correctness of the allegations or seeks appreciation of evidence collected during investigation. Here, the petitioners rely upon material which emerged subsequent to the registration and investigation of the FIR and which was placed on record by the State itself.

37. The subsequent inquiry is directly connected with the very series of criminal cases of which the present Crime No.58/2021 forms part. It is therefore not an unrelated subsequent event. The material has a direct bearing upon the bona fides of the initiation and continuation of the proceedings.

38. We are also conscious that the allegation that respondent No.10 exercised influence through respondent No.3 cannot be established merely from the coincidence of official postings. However, the State's own affidavit records the finding of the SIT regarding complicity of respondent No.3 and the subsequent recommendation for disciplinary proceedings. Thus, the allegation concerning misuse of police machinery does not remain a bare assertion of the petitioners.

39. Similarly, the fact that respondent No.11 was the driver of respondent No.10 cannot by itself establish that the present FIR

was lodged at the instance of respondent No.10. But, when this fact is considered along with the repeated prosecution of the same family members, the sequence of FIRs, the subsequent status of several connected proceedings and the official findings of the SIT, it becomes a relevant circumstance in assessing the allegation of a continuing collateral use of the criminal process.

40. We are therefore of the considered view that the present prosecution cannot be examined in isolation from the larger factual setting in which it arose. The Court is not determining the truth or falsity of every allegation contained in the FIR and is not adjudicating upon the merits of any other independent criminal proceeding. The limited question is whether, in the peculiar circumstances now brought on record, compelling the petitioners to undergo a full-fledged criminal trial in Crime No.58/2021 would advance the cause of justice or would amount to permitting an abuse of the process of law.

41. In our considered opinion, the latter is the consequence which would follow if the present prosecution is allowed to continue. The subsequent official inquiry, the finding that the series of eight cases were fabricated, the finding concerning complicity of respondent No.3, the disciplinary action/recommendation against the concerned police officials, the subsequent status of several connected proceedings and the recurring identity of the accused persons and persons connected with the complainant constitute

circumstances which materially undermine the bona fides of the present prosecution.

42. The Court is also conscious that the allegations against respondent No.11 are to be considered independently and that respondent No.11 cannot be made responsible merely because of his association with respondent No.10. However, the present petition concerns the continuation of the criminal prosecution itself. The material on record, taken cumulatively, demonstrates that Crime No.58/2021 forms part of the same course of proceedings which, upon subsequent official scrutiny by the State police authorities, has been found to suffer from serious irregularities and fabrication.

43. In the peculiar facts and circumstances of the present case, we are satisfied that the continuation of the criminal proceedings arising out of Crime No.58/2021 would amount to abuse of the process of the Court. The case therefore falls within the principles recognized by the Supreme Court in **Bhajan Lal** (supra), particularly the category concerning proceedings manifestly attended with mala fide and instituted or continued with an ulterior motive.

44. Accordingly, and for the reasons recorded hereinabove, the petition deserves to be and is hereby **allowed**. Crime No.58/2021 registered at Police Station Jarhagaon, District Mungeli, for offences punishable under Sections 420, 467, 468, 120-B and 212

of the Indian Penal Code, Charge-sheet No.77/2021, Supplementary Charge-sheet No.77-A/2022, the order framing charges and the entire consequential criminal proceedings arising out of Crime No.58/2021, pending before the Judicial Magistrate First Class, Mungeli, in Criminal Case No.796/2021, are hereby **quashed/set aside.**

45. So far as the other reliefs sought by the petitioners are concerned, they are at liberty to approach the appropriate forum for redressal of their grievances, if so advised.

Sd/-

(Ravindra Kumar Agrawal)
Judge

Sd/-

(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice