

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.78007 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-109 Year-2022 Thana- KHAGAUL District- Patna

=====

Rohit Kumar Tripathi @ Rohit Tripathi, son of Vimal Kumar Tripathi,
Resident of Quarter No. - B-5/15, I.G.I.M.S. Campus, Sheikhpura, P.S.-
Shastri Nagar, Dist. Patna.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. Om Prakash Tiwary (Head Constable), S/O - Ashwini Kumar Tiwary,
resident of Rajapur Machli Gali, Chanakyapuri, Makan No. 27-B, P.S.-
Shastri Nagar, District- Patna Bihar. At present CBI Head quarters, Special
Duty and research Zone, CGO Complex, Lodhi Road, New Delhi-110003

... .. Opposite Parties

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	Mr. P.N. Shahi, Sr. Advocate Mr. Vishwajeet Kumar Mishra, Advocate Mr. Anjani Parashar, Advocate Mr. Aakash Choudhary, Advocate
For the State	:	Ms. Nirmala Kumari, APP
For the Opp. Party No.2	:	Mr. Maheshwar Dhar Dwivedi, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR
ORAL JUDGMENT
Date : 13-08-2024

Heard learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner,
learned APP for the State and learned counsel for the opposite
party no.2.

2. Along with the written notes of arguments of
the petitioner, the certified copy of the complaint case no.274(c)
of 2021 as well as the certified copy of the order dated
23.06.2022 passed by the learned Magistrate in connection with



Complaint Case No.274 (c) of 2021 have been filed, which are taken on record.

3. This application has been filed for quashing of F.I.R. vide Khagaul P.S Case No. 109 of 2022 registered for the offence under sections 304-B/34 of the Indian Penal Code and all consequential proceedings arising out of the aforesaid F.I.R.

4. As per the F.I.R., the daughter of the informant namely, Shalini Tiwari was married to Rahul Kumar Tripathi on 24.06.2019. At the time of marriage the informant had given household articles worth Rs.20,00,000/- to the accused persons. After the marriage, the accused persons including the petitioner started demanding a *Swift Dzire* car and on account of non-fulfillment of said demand, the daughter of the informant was tortured by the accused persons. It is also alleged that the daughter of the informant was a teacher at Army Public School, Danapur but, her entire salary was taken by the her husband and his family members. Further, on 20.04.2022, the accused persons verbally abused and assaulted informant's daughter. The daughter of the informant informed this fact to her mother and also said that her in-laws are planning to kill her and they are not giving food to her. It is also alleged on the next day



at about 7:00 A.M. the son-in-law of the informant namely, Rahul Tripathi informed that his wife (daughter of the informant) has not taken food since morning and is not talking with him and has closed the door of her room. On receiving the information, the son of the informant went to the flat of his sister and enquired about his sister, upon which, the accused persons said that the doors of the room is closed. Thereafter, his son went near the room and saw that the doors of the room were open and his sister was hanging from the fan and her feet was touching the floor. Thereafter, she was taken to Paras Hospital where she was declared dead.

5. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegations, as alleged in the FIR, are serious in nature but whether the death was homicidal or suicidal is an aspect of investigation. He further submits that from perusal of the allegations, as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that apart from a bald allegation that the entire family members were demanding a *Swift D-zire* car and used to take her salary, no specific allegation is alleged against anyone.

6. Learned Senior Counsel for petitioner further submits that the petitioner has completed B.B.A L.L.B (Hons.) - 5 years course from Christ University, Bengaluru in the year



2018. He then enrolled as an Advocate with the Bar Council of Maharashtra and Goa and also cleared the Bar Council Examination having enrollment No. MAH/1987/2018 and started practicing in Mumbai, but later he shifted to Patna and started practicing before this Court and Civil Court. In the year 2021, he completed L.L.M in Corporate and Commercial Laws from Chanakya National Law University, Patna with 71.38% marks, as would be evident from Annexure-P/4 series. The petitioner also successfully cleared 31st Bihar Judicial Services Mains Examination and got selected securing 35th Rank in the merit list.

7. It has also been submitted by learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner appeared for the Assistant Prosecution Officer (APO) examination and cleared the preliminary examination. The petitioner has been preparing for the competitive examination in Delhi to pursue a career in Judicial Service and he has no concern with the matrimonial life of his elder brother and the deceased. The petitioner had come from Delhi to Patna only a few days before the date of occurrence, which is evident from the case diary. Further, nothing has been placed on record, even after several months of investigation, to connect the petitioner with the crime.



8. It has also been submitted by learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner that the occurrence took place after the petitioner had qualified in the Bihar Judicial Services Mains Examination and was preparing for his interview, as such, he was implicated in this case with general and omnibus allegations only with a view to ruin his career. It has also been submitted that the petitioner had also filed Cr. WJC No. 920 of 2022 praying for a direction upon the respondents to hold fair and proper investigation and to collect, secure and examine forensically the crucial electronic piece of evidence with regard to the present case. Further, an I.A. was also filed in the aforesaid criminal writ with a prayer that no coercive action be taken against the petitioner as he had to attend the interview for 31st Bihar Judicial Services Competitive Examination and this Court vide order dated 18.08.2022 restrained the authority from executing the warrant of arrest issued against the petitioner as he had to appear in the interview. Thereafter, petitioner was granted the privilege of anticipatory bail by order dated 5.12.2022 passed in Cr. Misc No. 35687 of 2022.

9. It has been argued by learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner that from perusal of the allegation, as alleged in the F.I.R., it would manifest that no specific allegation is



made against the petitioner. The petitioner hardly stayed with his family, as would be evident from the facts recorded hereinabove and only because the petitioner had qualified in the mains examination of the Bihar Judicial Services Examination and had to appear in the interview, he has been implicated in this case in order to ruin his career. It has also been argued that the postmortem report and the viscera report confirm the fact that the deceased has committed suicide by hanging. Further, the deceased was not receiving any salary as she had left her job due to the Covid-19 pandemic outbreak and was financially supported by her husband.

10. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner disputes the fact of a phone call to her mother-in-law, as alleged in the F.I.R., as the telecom bill does not support this fact. Further, the informant, who is employed in the C.B.I. has falsely implicated the petitioner in this case in order to ruin his life and career as no complaint or FIR against the petitioner regarding demand of dowry, torture or misbehavior was made prior to the alleged occurrence. There is no legal evidence connecting the petitioner with the alleged offence. The FIR, case diary or the charge-sheet does not disclose any demand of dowry or cruelty by the petitioner, who is the brother-in-law of the deceased.



11. It has also been submitted by learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner that the CCTV footage, as described by the Investigating Officer of the case in the Case Diary, shows that the petitioner was only helping in getting the deceased to the Hospital along with the brother of the deceased. Moreover, the bank account statements clearly show that all the expenses of the deceased including the education expenses were borne by the husband of the deceased and therefore, there is no question of demand of dowry from the deceased.

12. By making the aforesaid submissions, learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner submits that the present F.I.R. has been instituted against the petitioner with an ulterior motive for wreaking vengeance on the petitioner in order to run his career and therefore, this Court may allow this case and quash the F.I.R.

13. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner has relied upon the following judgments :-

(i) ***Mahmood Ali and Others vs. State of U.P and Ors.*** reported as ***2023 SCC OnLine SC 959.***

(ii) ***Mirza Iqbal alias Golu and Anr. vs. State of U.P and Anr.*** reported as ***2021***



SCC OnLine SC 1251.

***(iii) Maneesha Yadav and Ors. vs. The
State of Uttar Pradesh and Anr.
reported as 2024 SCC online SC 643.***

14. Learned counsel for the opposite party no.2(informant) submits that during the investigation, the Investigating Officer has found that the petitioner along with other co-accused persons were involved in another criminal case i.e. Complaint Case No. 274(c) of 2021 registered for the offences under sections 147, 341, 323, 384, 389, 420, 427, 504, 506 and 34 IPC, which is pending before the Court of learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Danapur, which is evident from paragraph no.150 of the case diary and therefore, the contention of the petitioner that no complaint or FIR regarding demand of dowry, torture or misbehavior was made prior to the alleged occurrence is misconceived.

15. Learned counsel for the opposite party no.2 also submits that during investigation several injuries were found on the body of the deceased, which is mentioned in the case diary and even the postmortem report also supports this injury which clearly proves that the deceased was physically tortured. He further submits that when the son of the informant,



Shivam Kumar Tiwari reached the place of occurrence, he found that all the accused persons were sitting together in the main hall of the flat and when he enquired about his sister, the accused persons replied that the doors of the room are locked but he found that the doors of the room were not locked and were open and his sister was hanging from the ceiling fan. Thereafter, the accused persons advised the son of the informant to dispose of the body, but he did not agree and upon his insistence the body of the deceased was brought to the Paras Hospital, Patna where she was declared dead.

16. In order to establish the complicity of the present petitioner, the learned counsel for the opposite party no.2 submits that the petitioner along with his friends tried to take away the dead-body of the deceased and even threatened the son of the informant with dire consequences but after learning that the police authorities were present, the petitioner along with his friends fled away from the hospital, which could be corroborated from the CCTV footage of the Paras Hospital. Further, the mobile location of the petitioner shows that after the marriage of the deceased, the petitioner used to live in Patna with his father, mother, elder brother and sister-in-law (the deceased) and during the police investigation several witnesses



have stated that all the accused persons were actually residing together. Therefore, the contention of the petitioner that he was preparing for Judicial Services Examination in Delhi is incorrect.

17. It has also been argued by learned counsel for the opposite party no.2 that the Supervising Authority i.e. the Additional Superintendent of Police, Danapur had accepted that there was a sign of rope at the neck of the deceased but the deceased was found hanging with a *dupatta*, and on the basis of the injury found on the body of the deceased, the Supervising Authority had formed an opinion that commission of assault on the body of the deceased before her death could not be denied, and therefore the offence under section 302 of the Indian Penal Code was also added by the Additional Superintendent of Police, however the charge sheet has been submitted only under section 304-B/34 of Indian Penal Code.

18. The next submission of learned counsel for the opposite party no.2 is that the *dupatta* by which the deceased was found hanging from the ceiling fan has not been produced by the accused before the police despite repeated requests by the Investigating Officer, which is substantiated from the case diary. Though the accused persons are trying to establish that it is a



case of suicide but the postmortem report speaks that it is a brutal murder, which could not have happened without the help of the petitioner.

19. Lastly, it has been submitted by learned counsel for the opposite party no.2 that if a person of bright carrier commits murder, there is no express provision in law to quash the criminal case pending against him and moreover, the fact whether it is a case of murder or suicide can only be decided during the trial.

20. I have considered the submissions of the parties and perused the materials on record. From reading of the F.I.R. and other materials available on record, it appears that the petitioner is the brother-in-law (*devar*) of the deceased. The marriage was solemnized in the year 2019. From the facts on record, it appears that the deceased may have committed suicide though it is a matter of trial. There is no allegation against the petitioner except general and omnibus allegations. The deceased was taken to Paras Hospital for treatment after she was found hanging in her room. The petitioner being a junior member of the family is not expected to demand dowry and torture the deceased. Moreover, it has come during investigation that most of the time the petitioner was not staying in the house but was



preparing for Judicial Services Examination in Delhi.

21. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Mahmood Ali and Others vs. State of U.P.*** (supra) while considering an application in which the quashment of the criminal proceeding was sought on the ground of frivolous and vexatious proceedings instituted with an ulterior motive for wreaking vengeance, has held that the Court has a duty to examine the F.I.R./complaint as the complainant/informant may draft the F.I.R./complaint meticulously ensuring that it include all necessary details and elements of the alleged offence. It is not sufficient for the Court to solely rely on the averments of the F.I.R./complaint to determine the essential ingredients of the offence.

22. It will be relevant to quote paragraph no.13 of the aforesaid decision, which reads as under:-

“13. At this stage, we would like to observe something important. Whenever an accused comes before the Court invoking either the inherent powers under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (CrPC) or extraordinary jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution to get the FIR or the criminal proceedings quashed essentially on the ground that such proceedings are manifestly frivolous or vexatious or instituted with the ulterior motive for wreaking vengeance, then in such circumstances the Court owes a duty to look into the FIR with care and a little more closely. We say so



because once the complainant decides to proceed against the accused with an ulterior motive for wreaking personal vengeance, etc., then he would ensure that the FIR/complaint is very well drafted with all the necessary pleadings. The complainant would ensure that the averments made in the FIR/complaint are such that they disclose the necessary ingredients to constitute the alleged offence. Therefore, it will not be just enough for the Court to look into the averments made in the FIR/complaint alone for the purpose of ascertaining whether the necessary ingredients to constitute the alleged offence are disclosed or not. In frivolous or vexatious proceedings, the Court owes a duty to look into many other attending circumstances emerging from the record of the case over and above the averments and, if need be, with due care and circumspection try to read in between the lines. The Court while exercising its jurisdiction under Section 482 of the CrPC or Article 226 of the Constitution need not restrict itself only to the stage of a case but is empowered to take into account the overall circumstances leading to the initiation/registration of the case as well as the materials collected in the course of investigation. Take for instance the case on hand. Multiple FIRs have been registered over a period of time. It is in the background of such circumstances the registration of multiple FIRs assumes importance, thereby attracting the issue of wreaking vengeance out of private or personal grudge as alleged.”

23. In the case of ***Mirza Iqbal @ Golu and Anr.***
vs. State of Uttar Pradesh and Anr. (supra) again while considering the case of the brother-in-law and mother-in-law of



the deceased for quashing of the criminal proceeding in connection with a case of dowry death, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in paragraph nos.11 and 12 has held as under:

“11. The appellants are brother-in-law and mother-in-law respectively of the deceased. A perusal of the complaint filed by the 2nd respondent, pursuant to which a crime was registered, does not indicate any specific allegations by disclosing the involvement of the appellants. It is the specific case of the 1st appellant that he was working as a cashier in ICICI Bank at Khalilabad branch, which is at about 40 kms from Gorakhpur. The alleged incident was on 24.07.2018 at about 8 p.m. When the investigation was pending, the 1st appellant has filed affidavit before Senior Superintendent of Police on 08.08.2018, giving his employment details and stated that he was falsely implicated. It was his specific case that during the relevant time, he was working at ICICI Bank, Khalilabad branch, Gorakhpur and his mother was also staying with him. The Branch Manager has endorsed his presence in the branch, showing in-time at 09:49 a.m. and out-time at 06:25 p.m. Even in the statement of 2nd respondent recorded by the police and also in the final report filed under Section 173(2) of Cr.P.C., except omnibus and vague allegations, there is no specific allegation against the appellants to show their involvement for the offences alleged. This Court, time and again, has noticed making the family members of husband as accused by making casual reference to them in matrimonial disputes. Learned senior counsel for the appellants, in support of her case, placed reliance on the judgment of this Court in the case of Geeta Mehrotra v. State of Uttar Pradesh (2012) 10



SCC 741. In the aforesaid case, this Court in identical circumstances, has quashed the proceedings by observing that family members of husband were shown as accused by making casual reference to them. In the very same judgment, it is held that a large number of family members are shown in the FIR by casually mentioning their names and the contents do not disclose their active involvement, as such, taking cognizance of the matter against them was not justified. It is further held that taking cognizance in such type of cases results in abuse of judicial process. Paras 18 and 25 of the said judgment, which are relevant for the purpose of this case, read as under:

“18. Their Lordships of the Supreme Court in Ramesh case [(2005)3 SCC 507 : 2005 SCC (Cri) 735] had been pleased to hold that the bald allegations made against the sister-in-law by the complainant appeared to suggest the anxiety of the informant to rope in as many of the husband's relatives as possible. It was held that neither the FIR nor the charge-sheet furnished the legal basis for the Magistrate to take cognizance of the offences alleged against the appellants. The learned Judges were pleased to hold that looking to the allegations in the FIR and the contents of the charge-sheet, none of the alleged offences under Sections 498-A, 406 IPC and Section 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act were made against the married sister of the complainant's husband who was undisputedly not living with the family of the complainant's husband. Their Lordships of the Supreme Court were



pleased to hold that the High Court ought not to have relegated the sister-in-law to the ordeal of trial. Accordingly, the proceedings against the appellants were quashed and the appeal was allowed.

25. However, we deem it appropriate to add by way of caution that we may not be misunderstood so as to infer that even if there are allegations of overt act indicating the complicity of the members of the family named in the FIR in a given case, cognizance would be unjustified but what we wish to emphasise by highlighting is that, if the FIR as it stands does not disclose specific allegation against the accused more so against the co-accused specially in a matter arising out of matrimonial bickering, it would be clear abuse of the legal and judicial process to mechanically send the named accused in the FIR to undergo the trial unless of course the FIR discloses specific allegations which would persuade the court to take cognizance of the offence alleged against the relatives of the main accused who are prima facie not found to have indulged in physical and mental torture of the complainant wife. It is the well-settled principle laid down in cases too numerous to mention, that if the FIR did not disclose the commission of an offence, the court would be justified in quashing the proceedings preventing the abuse of process of law. Simultaneously, the courts are expected to adopt a cautious approach in matters of quashing, especially in



cases of matrimonial disputes 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.”

12. *From a perusal of the complaint filed by the 2nd respondent and the final report filed by the police under Section 173(2) of Cr.P.C., we are of the view that the aforesaid judgment fully supports the case of the appellants. Even in the counter affidavits filed on behalf of respondent nos.1 and 2, it is not disputed that the 1st appellant was working in ICICI Bank at Khalilabad branch, but merely stated that there was a possibility to reach Gorakhpur by 8 p.m. Though there is an allegation of causing injuries, there are no other external injuries noticed in the postmortem certificate, except the single ante-mortem injury i.e. ligature mark around the neck, and the cause of death is shown as asphyxia. Having regard to the case of the appellants and the material placed on record, we are of the considered view that except vague and bald allegations against the appellants, there are no specific allegations disclosing the involvement of the appellants to prosecute them for the offences alleged. In view of the judgment of this Court in the case of Geeta Mehrotra and Anr., which squarely applies to the case of the appellants, we are of the view that it is a fit case to quash the proceedings.”*

24. In Maneesha Yadav & Ors. vs. The State of



Uttar Pradesh and Anr. (supra) the Hon'ble Supreme Court in paragraph no.14 has held as follows:-

“14. We may gainfully refer to the observations of this Court in the case of Anand Kumar Mohatta and Another v. State (NCT of Delhi), Department of Home (2019) 11 SCC 706:

"14. First, we would like to deal with the submission of the learned Senior Counsel for Respondent 2 that once the charge-sheet is filed, petition for quashing of FIR is untenable. We do not see any merit in this submission, keeping in mind the position of this Court in Joseph Salvaraj A. v. State of Gujarat [Joseph Salvaraj A. v. State of Gujarat, (2011) 7 SCC 59 : (2011) 3 SCC (Cri) 23]. In Joseph Salvaraj A. [Joseph Salvaraj A. v. State of Gujarat, (2011) 7 SCC 59 : (2011) 3 SCC (Cri) 23], this Court while deciding the question whether the High Court could entertain the Section 482 petition for quashing of FIR, when the charge-sheet was filed by the police during the pendency of the Section 482 petition, observed : (SCC p. 63, para 16)

"16. Thus, from the general conspectus of the various sections under which the appellant is being charged and is to be prosecuted would show that the same are not made out even prima facie from the complainant's FIR. Even if the charge-sheet had been filed, the learned Single Judge [Joseph Saivraj A. v. State of Gujarat, 2007 SCC OnLine Guj 365] could have still examined whether the offences alleged to have been committed by the appellant were prima facie made out



from the complainant's FIR, charge-sheet, documents, etc. or not."

15. Even otherwise it must be remembered that the provision invoked by the accused before the High Court is Section 482 CrPC and that this Court is hearing an appeal from an order under Section 482 CrPC. Section 482 CrPC reads as follows:

"482. Saving of inherent powers of the High Court.- Nothing in this Code shall be deemed to limit or affect the inherent powers of the High Court to make such orders as may be necessary to give effect to any order under this Code, or to prevent abuse of the process of any court or otherwise to secure the ends of justice."

16. There is nothing in the words of this section which restricts the exercise of the power of the Court to prevent the abuse of process of court or miscarriage of justice only to the stage of the FIR. It is settled principle of law that the High Court can exercise jurisdiction under Section 482 CrPC even when the discharge application is pending with the trial court [G. Sagar Suri v. State of U.P., (2000) 2 SCC 636, para 7 : 2000 SCC (Cri) 513. Umesh Kumar v. State of A.P., (2013) 10 SCC 591, para 20 : (2014) 1 SCC (Cri) 338 : (2014) 2 SCC (L&S) 237]. Indeed, it would be a travesty to hold that proceedings initiated against a person can be interfered with at the stage of FIR but not if it has advanced and the allegations have materialised into a chargesheet. On the contrary it could be said that the abuse of process caused by FIR stands aggravated if the



FIR has taken the form of a charge-sheet after investigation. The power is undoubtedly conferred to prevent abuse of process of power of any court."

25. Considering the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the cases of ***Mahmood Ali and Others vs. State of U.P. ; Mirza Iqbal @ Golu and Anr. vs. State of Uttar Pradesh and Anr.*** and ***Maneesha Yadav & Ors. vs. The State of Uttar Pradesh and Anr.*** (supra), I am of the view that this is a fit case in which the quashing application of the petitioner should be entertained under section 482 of the Cr.P.C. as from the reading of the F.I.R. and other materials on record, it appears that there is general and omnibus allegation against the petitioner, who is brother-in-law (*devar*) of the deceased. Though in the F.I.R. and other materials, the informant has tried to bring out the ingredients of the offences but considering the fact that the petitioner was preparing for his Judicial Services Examination in Delhi and subsequently, qualified in the same, I am of the view that after the death of the deceased, the family members of the deceased have filed a case against all the family members of the husband of the deceased including the petitioner with a view to ruin the career of the petitioner though there is no material to directly connect the petitioner with the alleged crime. He has been made accused



merely because he is the brother-in-law of the deceased. This tendency of making all the family members of the husband of the deceased as accused has been deprecated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in a number of judgments.

26. Furthermore, the F.I.R. does not disclose any specific allegation against the petitioner and the same arises out of a matrimonial dispute. The petitioner cannot be asked to undergo trial because the F.I.R. does not disclose specific allegations to persuade this Court to take a view that the petitioner should undergo trial. The petitioner is a junior member of the family i.e. brother-in-law of the deceased and *prima facie* it appears that he has not indulged in physical and mental torture of the deceased. Simply because the petitioner is brother-in-law of the deceased and there is general and omnibus allegation against him, he should not undergo the rigors of trial. The F.I.R. and the other materials do not bring out any specific allegation against the petitioner of having tortured the deceased, who was his *bhabhi* and it also appears that he has been falsely implicated at the instance of the informant, who is none other but the father of the deceased.

27. So far as the contention of learned counsel for the opposite party no.2 that the petitioner along with other



co-accused persons were involved in another criminal case i.e. Complaint Case No. 274(c) of 2021 prior to lodging of the present F.I.R. is concerned, it appears from the certified copy of the complaint petition of Complaint case no.274(c) of 2021 that in the aforesaid complaint case the petitioner was not made an accused rather Vimal Kumar Tripathi, Rahul Kumar Tripathi, Vivek Kumar Tripathi, Khusboo Devi and Prashant Kumar Mishra were made accused. Even otherwise, in the aforesaid complaint case the cognizance has been taken only against Vimal Kumar Tripathi, who is the father of the petitioner, under sections 341, 323, 427 & 506 of the Indian Penal Code, which is evident from the certified copy of the order dated 23.06.2022 passed by the learned Magistrate in connection with Complaint Case No.274(c) of 2021.

28. In the opinion of this Court, the submission of learned counsel for the opposite party no.2 is misconceived and has been made only with a view to mislead this Court. This kind of false submission is fit to be rejected and deprecated.

29. In view of the aforesaid discussions, this application is allowed. Accordingly, the F.I.R. vide Khagaul P.S Case No. 109 of 2022 registered for the offence under sections 304-B/34 of the Indian Penal Code and all consequential



proceedings arising out of the aforesaid F.I.R. are hereby
quashed with respect to present petitioner only.

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

pawan/-

AFR/NAFR	N.A.F.R.
CAV DATE	N/A.
Uploading Date	14.08.2024
Transmission Date	14.08.2024

