

03.12.2024
Item. 19
BR

CRR 4383 of 2022
Debabrata Jana
-vs-
The State of West Bengal & Anr.

Mr. Anath Bandhu Datta,
Mr. Bhaskar Seth,
Mr. Mukesh Kumar Gupta
... for the Petitioner

Mr. Saryati Datta,
Ms. Puspita Saha
... for the State

Mr. Arka Ranjan Bhattacharya
... for the O.P. No. 2

1. The present revision has been preferred praying for quashing of the proceeding being G.R. No. 2723 of 2022, arising out of Beliaghata Police Station Case No. 130/2022 dated 29.10.2022 under Sections 406/506 of the Indian Penal Code pending before the learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Sealdah and all orders passed thereto.
2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, the opposite party and the learned counsel for the State who has placed the case diary.
3. The proceeding in the present case was initiated on the basis of an application under Section 156(3) of Cr. P.C. wherein the petitioner has alleged that when she went to bring her articles from the custody of the accused persons on 15.07.2022, the accused persons abused the petitioners

in filthy languages and threatened her with dire consequences. The petitioner did not return the stridhan articles and she returned home and filed the present case.

4. At the time of hearing, the learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the marriage between the parties has been dissolved by a decree of divorce on mutual consent by an order dated 30.11.2021 passed by the learned Additional District Judge, FTC-II, Sealdah. The present complaint has been initiated in the year 2022. The dispute was regarding the return of stridhan articles.
5. The learned counsel appearing for the opposite party no. 2 has strongly objected to the prayer for quashing and submitted that the opposite party no. 2 was actually put into such harassment and as such there is a prima facie case and the petitioners should face trial.
6. The learned counsel for the State has produced the case diary wherein it appears from the seizure lists that the stridhan articles as listed by the petitioners have been recovered from the accused persons and also received by the opposite party no.2.
7. In ***Umesh Kumar Vs State of Andhra Pradesh and Anr., 2013 (10) SCC 591, decided on 6th September, 2013***, the Supreme Court held :-

“20. The scope of Section 482 CrPC is well defined and inherent powers could be exercised by the High Court to give effect to an order under CrPC; to prevent abuse of the process of court; and to otherwise secure the ends of justice. This extraordinary power is to be exercised ex debito justitiae. However, in exercise of such powers, it is not permissible for the High Court to appreciate the evidence as it can only evaluate

material documents on record to the extent of its prima facie satisfaction about the existence of sufficient ground for proceedings against the accused and the Court cannot look into materials, the acceptability of which is essentially a matter for trial. Any document filed along with the petition labelled as evidence without being tested and proved, cannot be examined. The law does not prohibit entertaining the petition under Section 482 CrPC for quashing the charge-sheet even before the charges are framed or before the application of discharge is filed or even during the pendency of such application before the court concerned. The High Court cannot reject the application merely on the ground that the accused can argue legal and factual issues at the time of the framing of the charge. However, the inherent power of the Court should not be exercised to stifle the legitimate prosecution but can be exercised to save the accused from undergoing the agony of a criminal trial. (Vide Pepsi Foods Ltd. v. Judicial Magistrate [(1998) 5 SCC 749 : 1998 SCC (Cri) 1400 : AIR 1998 SC 128] , Ashok Chaturvedi v. Shitul H. Chanchani [(1998) 7 SCC 698 : 1998 SCC (Cri) 1704 : AIR 1998 SC 2796] , G. Sagar Suri v. State of U.P. [(2000) 2 SCC 636 : 2000 SCC (Cri) 513] and Padal Venkata Rama Reddy v. Kovvuri Satyanarayana Reddy [(2011) 12 SCC 437 : (2012) 1 SCC (Cri) 603] .)

21. In *Rajiv Thapar v. Madan Lal Kapoor* [(2013) 3 SCC 330 : (2013) 3 SCC (Cri) 158] this Court while dealing with the issue held as follows : (SCC p. 348, para 30)

“30. Based on the factors canvassed in the foregoing paragraphs, we would delineate the following steps to determine the veracity of a prayer for quashment raised by an accused by invoking the power vested in the High Court under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure:

30.1. Step one : Whether the material relied upon by the accused is sound, reasonable and indubitable i.e. the material is of sterling and impeccable quality?

30.2. Step two : Whether the material relied upon by the accused would rule out the assertions contained in the charges levelled against the accused i.e. the material is sufficient to reject and overrule the factual assertions contained in the complaint i.e. the

material is such as would persuade a reasonable person to dismiss and condemn the factual basis of the accusations as false?

30.3. Step three : Whether the material relied upon by the accused has not been refuted by the prosecution/complainant; and/or the material is such that it cannot be justifiably refuted by the prosecution/complainant?

30.4. Step four : Whether proceeding with the trial would result in an abuse of process of the court, and would not serve the ends of justice?"

22. In State of Bihar v. P.P. Sharma [1992 Supp (1) SCC 222 : 1992 SCC (Cri) 192 : AIR 1991 SC 1260] this Court dealt with an issue of whether an application under Section 482 CrPC for quashing the charge-sheet should be entertained before cognizance is taken by a criminal court and held as under : (SCC pp. 269-70, para 68)

"68. ... Quashing the charge-sheet even before cognizance is taken by a criminal court amounts to 'killing a stillborn child'. Till the criminal court takes cognizance of the offence there is no criminal proceedings pending. I am not allowing the appeals on the ground that alternative remedies provided by the Code as a bar. It may be relevant in an appropriate case. My view is that entertaining the writ petitions against charge-sheet and considering the matter on merit in the guise of prima facie evidence to stand an accused for trial amounts to pre-trial of a criminal trial.... It is not to suggest that under no circumstances a writ petition should be entertained. ... The charge-sheet and the evidence placed in support thereof form the base to take or refuse to take cognizance by the competent court. It is not the case that no offence has been made out in the charge-sheets and the first information report."

(emphasis supplied)

23. *The issue of mala fides loses its significance if there is a substance in the allegation made in the complaint moved with malice. In Sheonandan Paswan v. State of Bihar [(1987) 1 SCC 288 : 1987 SCC (Cri) 82 : AIR 1987 SC 877] this Court held as under : (SCC p. 318, para 16)*

“16. ... It is a well-established proposition of law that a criminal prosecution, if otherwise justifiable and based upon adequate evidence does not become vitiated on account of mala fides or political vendetta of the first informant or the complainant.”

24. In Parkash Singh Badal v. State of Punjab [(2007) 1 SCC 1 : (2007) 1 SCC (Cri) 193 : AIR 2007 SC 1274] this Court held as under : (SCC p. 43, para 74)

“74. The ultimate test, therefore, is whether the allegations have any substance. An investigation should not be shut out at the threshold because a political opponent or a person with political difference raises an allegation of commission of offence. Therefore, the plea of mala fides as raised cannot be maintained.”

25. In State of A.P. v. Golconda Linga Swamy [(2004) 6 SCC 522 : 2004 SCC (Cri) 1805 : AIR 2004 SC 3967] this Court held as under : (SCC p. 529, para 8)

“8. ... It is the material collected during the investigation and evidence led in court which decides the fate of the accused person. The allegations of mala fides against the informant are of no consequence and cannot by themselves be the basis for quashing the proceeding.”

(See also K. Karunakaran v. State of Kerala [(2007) 1 SCC 59 : (2007) 1 SCC (Cri) 251] .)

26. Thus, in view of the above, it becomes evident that in case there is some substance in the allegations and material exists to substantiate the complicity of the applicant, the case is to be examined in its full conspectus and the proceedings should not be quashed only on the ground that the same had been initiated with mala fides to wreak vengeance or to achieve an ulterior goal.

27. The scheme for inquiry/trial provided under CrPC is quite clear. After investigation, report under Section 173(2) CrPC is to be submitted before the competent court i.e. the Magistrate having jurisdiction in the matter and the Magistrate may take cognizance under Section 190 CrPC. However,

it is still open to the Magistrate to direct further investigation under the provisions of Section 173(8) CrPC. If the case is triable by the Court of Session, the Magistrate would commit the case to the said court under Section 209 CrPC. It is for the court to examine whether there is sufficient material collected during investigation and filed along with the charge-sheet that a prima facie view can be taken to proceed against the accused and in view thereof, frame charges under Section 228 CrPC. At this stage the remedy available to the accused is to ask for discharge under Section 227 CrPC. In case charges are framed the accused has to face the trial, charges can be added/alterd at any stage of the trial, before the pronouncement of the judgment to suit the evidence adduced before the court, under the provisions of Section 216 CrPC. The only legal requirement is that a witness has to be recalled as provided under Section 217 CrPC when a charge is altered or added by the court.”

8. As such permitting such a case to a trial will an abuse of process of law as the purpose has been fulfilled and is found that prima facie there is no material other than a written complaint to substantiate the allegations in respect of the offences alleged against the petitioner.
9. **Accordingly, CRR 4383 of 2022 is, thus, allowed and hereby quashed.**
10. All applications connected thereto stand disposed of.
11. Interim order, if any, stands vacated.
12. Let a copy of the order be sent to the learned trial Court for compliance.
13. Urgent Xerox certified copies of this order, if applied for, shall be supplied to the learned counsel for the parties as expeditiously as possible, in compliance of usual formalities.

(Shampa Dutt (Paul), J.)