

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE U.DURGA PRASAD RAO

CRIMINAL PETITION No.1344 of 2015

ORDER:

In this petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C, the petitioner/A.9 seeks quashment of the proceedings in C.C.No.374 of 2008 on the file of learned Special Judicial Magistrate of First Class, Erramanzil, Hyderabad.

2) The petitioner/Accused No.9 along with A.1 to A.8 and A10 to A12 is accused of committing offences under Sections 3, 4 and 7 of Immoral Traffic (Prevention) Act, 1956 (for short "the Act"). On the evening of 15.02.2006, the Police of Chikkadpally raided the House bearing No.1-1-287/30, Bapunagar, Chikkadpally found the said premises being used for prostitution. A.1 and A.2 were said to be the brothel house organizers, whereas A.8 to A.12 are the customers. The police registered crime and investigating the matter.

3) Learned counsel for petitioner would submit that none of the Sections 3, 4 and 7 or other sections of the Act describe a customer as offender and therefore, the prosecution of the petitioner/A.9 is abuse of process of law and hence the proceedings against him may be quashed.

4) Learned Public Prosecutor contended A.9 is a co-accused and liable for prosecution.

5) I find force in the submission of petitioner. Section 3 of

the Act deals with punishment for keeping a brothel or allowing premises to be used as a brothel. Section 4 of the Act deals with punishment for living on the earnings of the prostitution. Section 5 of the Act deals with procuring, inducing or taking persons for the sake of prostitution. Obviously, the allegation against the petitioner/A.9 is not that of either running brothel house or procuring women for the purpose of prostitution or that he is living by earning money on prostitution. He was booked along with other accused only as a customer of the flesh trade. Therefore, the said Sections are not applicable to him. It is interesting to note that none of the other penal provisions in the Act either describe him as an offender. Therefore, there is any amount of force in the submission of learned counsel for petitioner that a customer to the flesh trade cannot be treated as an offender under the Act. This aspect is no more *res integra* and we are fortified by atleast two judgments of this High Court viz., ***Goenka Sajan Kumar vs. The State of A.P.***^[1] and ***Z . Lourdiah Naidu vs. State of Andhra Pradesh***^[2]. In these two cases, the petitioners were admittedly the customers to a brothel house. Consequently, the proceedings against them were quashed holding that the provisions of the Act cannot be invoked for prosecuting them.

6) Having regard to the facts and above precedential jurisprudence on the subject in issue, it is clear that the

criminal proceedings against the petitioner would amount to abuse of process of law.

7) In the result, this Criminal Petition is allowed quashing the proceedings against petitioner/A.9 in C.C.No.374 of 2008 on the file of learned Special Judicial Magistrate of First Class, Erramanzil, Hyderabad.

As a sequel, Miscellaneous Petitions pending, if any, shall stand closed.

U.DURGA PRASAD RAO, J

Date: 06.03.2015

Murthy

[\[1\]](#) 2014(2)ALD(Cri)264

[\[2\]](#) 2013(2)ALD(Cri)393