

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-43247-2016

Date of decision: 6.12.2017

Sukhwinder Pal Singh and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr.VK Thakur, Advocate for the petitioners

Mr.Rana Harjasdeep Singh, AAG, Punjab

None for respondent No.2

Respondent no.3 with
Mr.Preshant Thakur, Advocate

JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J.

This petition under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure has been filed for quashing of First Information Report No.157 dated 20.12.2011, registered under Sections 363 and 366A of the Indian Penal Code (for short 'the IPC'), at Police Station Sultanpur Lodhi, District Kapurthala, and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise arrived at between the parties.

Respondent No.3 duly identified by her counsel is present in person.

Mr. Swapan Shorey, Advocate, who is on the panel of Mediators available for mediation today, was appointed as Mediator to record the statement of respondent No.3 (victim). In her statement,

recorded by the Mediator, which is taken on record as Mark 'A', respondent No.3 stated that she has performed marriage with Sukhwinder Pal Singh -petitioner No.1 and is residing with him happily.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

Hon'ble the Supreme Court in **S. Varadarajan Vs. State of Madras, 1965 AIR (SC)942**, has observed as under:-

“9. It must, however, be borne in mind that there is a distinction between "taking" and allowing a minor to accompany a person. The two expressions are not synonymous though we would like to guard ourselves from laying down that in no conceivable circumstance can the two be regarded as meaning the same thing for the purposes of Section 361 of the Indian Penal Code. We would limit ourselves to a case like the present where the minor alleged to have been taken by the accused person left her father's protection knowing and having capacity to know the full import of what she was doing voluntarily joins the accused person. In such a case we do not think that the accused can be said to have taken her away from the keeping of her lawful guardian. Something more has to be shown in a case of this kind and that is some kind of inducement held out by the accused person or an active participation by him in the formation of the

intention of the minor to leave the house of the guardian.

10. It would, however, be sufficient if the prosecution establishes that though immediately prior to the minor leaving the father's protection no active part was played by the accused, he had at some earlier stage solicited or persuaded the minor to do so. In our, opinion if evidence to establish one of those things is lacking it would not be legitimate to infer that the accused is guilty of taking the minor out of the keeping of the lawful guardian merely because after she has actually left her guardian's house or a house where her guardian had kept her, joined the accused and the accused helped her in her design not to return to her guardian's house by taking her along with him from place to place. No doubt, the part played by the accused could be regarded as facilitating the fulfillment of the intention of the girl. That part, in our opinion, falls short of an inducement to the minor to slip out of the keeping of her lawful guardian and is, therefore, not tantamount to 'taking'."

Keeping in view the statement made by prosecutrix and in view of the ratio of law laid down in **S. Varadarajan's** case (supra), no

case under Sections 363 and 366A IPC, at Police Station Sultanpur Lodhi, District Kapurthala, is made out, as the prosecutrix had reached the age of discretion and she is happily residing at her matrimonial home out of her own sweet will, this Court feels that no useful purpose would be served in keeping the proceedings alive.

Accordingly, the present petition is allowed. First Information Report No.157 dated 20.12.2011, registered under Sections 363 and 366A IPC, at Police Station Sultanpur Lodhi, District Kapurthala and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom are hereby quashed qua the present petitioners.

6.12.2017
gsv

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking / reasoned?

Yes / No

Whether reportable?

Yes / No