

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

955 CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 1871 OF 2021

VARSHA W/O. RAMESH KHADE AND ANOTHER
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND ANOTHER

.....

Advocate for Applicants : Mr. Kaldate Sunil D.
APP for Respondent No.1-State : Mrs. P. V. Diggikar
Advocate for Respondent No.2 : Mr. Rajendra G. Hange &
Mr. Anirudh R. Hange

.....

CORAM : V. K. JADHAV AND
SANDIPKUMAR. C. MORE, JJ.
DATED : 25th MARCH, 2022

PER COURT:-

1. Heard finally with consent at admission stage.
2. The applicants are seeking quashing of FIR No. 92 of 2021 registered with Shirur Police Station, District Beed for the offence punishable under Sections 498-A, 323, 504, 506 r.w. 34 of IPC and also seeking quashing of the proceedings arose out of the said crime, bearing R.C.C. No. 73/2021 pending before the Judicial Magistrate, First Class, Shirur, District Beed.

3. Learned counsel for the applicants submits that applicant no.1 is the married sister in law and applicant no.2 is her husband, who is a Government servant. Learned counsel submits that the allegations as against them are general and absurd in nature. Though their names are mentioned in the FIR, however, no specific individual role has been attributed to them.

4. Learned counsel for respondent no.2 submits that names of the applicants are mentioned in the FIR and further, a specific role is attributed to them in respect of the incident dated 17.07.2021 referred in the complaint. Learned counsel submits that there are independent eye witnesses, namely Annasaheb Yewale and Appasaheb Yewale, in support of the allegations in respect of the incident dated 17.07.2021. There is a triable case against both the applicants. There is no substance in this criminal application and the same is liable to be dismissed.

5. We have also heard learned APP for the respondent State.

6. We have carefully gone through the contents of the complaint and also perused the charge-sheet. Though we find names of the applicants mentioned in the FIR, however, the allegations as against

them are general and absurd in nature. So far as the incident dated 17.07.2021 as referred in the compliant is concerned, the allegations in respect of the said incident are also general in nature without quoting any specific individual role. Furthermore, we have carefully gone through the police statement of the said witnesses Annasaheb Yewale and Appasaheb Yewale. However, they have no personal knowledge about the manner in which the incident has allegedly taken place and as per their statement, they came to know the names of the persons, including the names of the applicants, from others.

7. In the case of ***Gita Mehrotra and others v. State of U.P. and others***, reported in AIR 2013 SC 181, the Supreme Court has observed that “Courts are expected to adopt a cautious approach in matters of quashing specially in cases of matrimonial dispute whether the FIR in fact discloses commission of an offence by the relatives of the principal accused or the FIR prima facie discloses a case of over-implication by involving the entire family of the accused at the instance of the complainant, who is out to settle her scores arising out of the teething problem or skirmish of domestic bickering while settling down in her new matrimonial surrounding.”

8. In the case of ***Neelu Chopra and others v. Bharti***, reported in 2010 CrLJ 448, the Supreme Court has observed that, “In order to lodge a proper complaint, mere mention of the sections and the language of those sections is not be all and end of the matter. What is required to be brought to the notice of the Court is the particulars of the offence committed by each and every accused and the role played by each and every accused in committing of that offence. The complaint in the instant case is sadly vague. It does not show as to which accused has committed what offence and what is the exact role played by these appellants in the commission of offence. There could be said something against Rajesh, as the allegations are made against him more precisely but he is no more and has already expired. Under such circumstances, it would be an abuse of process of law to allow the prosecution to continue against the aged parents of Rajesh, the present appellants herein on the basis of vague and general complaint which is silent about the precise acts of the appellants”.

9. In the case of ***Taramani Parakh v. State of Madhya Pradesh and others***, reported in (2015) 11 SCC 260, in para 10, 14 and 15 the Supreme Court has made the following observations:

“10. The law relating to quashing is well settled. If the allegations are absurd or do not make out any case or if it can be held that there is abuse of process of law, the proceedings can be quashed but if there is a triable case the court does not go into reliability or otherwise of the version or the counter-version. In matrimonial cases, the courts have to be cautious when omnibus allegations are made particularly against relatives who are not generally concerned with the affairs of the couple. We may refer to the decisions of this Court dealing with the issue.

11. to 13.

14. From a reading of the complaint, it cannot be held that even if the allegations are taken as proved no case is made out. There are allegations against Respondent 2 and his parents for harassing the complainant which forced her to leave the matrimonial home. Even now she continues to be separated from the matrimonial home as she apprehends lack of security and safety and proper environment in the matrimonial home. The question whether the appellant has in fact been harassed and treated with cruelty is a matter of trial but at this

stage, it cannot be said that no case is made out. Thus, quashing of proceedings before the trial is not permissible.

15. *The decisions referred to in the judgment of the High Court are distinguishable. In **Neelu Chopra v. Bharti**, (2009) 10 SCC 184, the parents of the husband were too old. The husband Rajesh had died and main allegations were only against him. This Court found no cogent material against the other accused. In **Manoj Mahavir Prasad Khaitan v. Ram Gopal Poddar**, (2010) 10 SCC 673 the appellant before this Court was the brother of the daughter-in-law of the accused who lodged the case against the accused for theft of jewellery during pendency of earlier Section 498-A IPC case. This Court found the said to be absurd. In **Geeta Mehrotra v. State of U.P.** (2012) 10 SCC 741, case was against brother and sister of the husband. Divorce had taken place between the parties. The said cases neither purport to nor can be read as laying down any inflexible rule beyond the principles of quashing which have been mentioned above and applied to the facts of the cases therein which are distinguishable. In the present case the factual matrix is different from the said cases. Applying the settled principles, it cannot be held that there is no triable case against the accused.”*

10. It is well settled that if the allegations are absurd or do not make out any case, then the proceedings are liable to be quashed. In the instant case, even if the allegations as made against these applicants are held to be proved, no case is made out. Applicant no.1 is the married sister in law residing with her husband applicant no.2 at her matrimonial place. Applicant no.2 is stated to be a Government servant. Except general allegations, no role has been ascribed to these applicants. It is a case of over-implication. On the basis of such general and absurd allegations, if the proceedings remained continued, there would be an abuse of the process of the Court.

11. In view of the above and in terms of the ratio laid down by the Supreme Court in the above cited cases, we proceed to pass the following order:

ORDER

I. The criminal application is allowed in terms of prayer clauses “C” and “C-1”.

II. The criminal application is accordingly disposed off.

(SANDIPKUMAR C. MORE, J.)

(V. K. JADHAV, J.)