


2024:PHHC:076698



124

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-27843-2021 (O&M)
Date of decision: 29.05.2024

Vinita John

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Kushagra Beniwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Geeta Sharma, DAG, Haryana.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J.

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (for short 'Cr.P.C.') for quashing of FIR No.199 dated 16.02.2022 under Sections 323, 34, 406, 498-A, 506 of IPC (Section 406 of IPC added later on), registered at Police Station Shahabad, District Kurukshetra (Annexure P-1) and the final report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. dated 26.05.2022 as well as all the subsequent proceedings emanating therefrom.

2024:PHHC:076698



2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that FIR (*supra*) had been registered after a delay of two and half years and husband of the petitioner has been declared innocent on the same set of allegations and no specific allegation has been levelled against the petitioner and all the allegations contained in the FIR (*supra*) are generic in nature, which lack specificity. The present FIR had been registered as a counter-blast to the petition filed by son of the petitioner, namely Sunny John, under Section 9 of the Hindu Marriage Act seeking restitution of conjugal rights and respondent No.2 refused to join his company. He relies upon a judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Achin Gupta Vs. State of Haryana and another, 2024 SCC OnLine SC 759*** and submits that this case is squarely covered by the aforesaid judgment even on facts.

3. Per contra, learned State counsel submits that there is specific entrustment of ornaments to the petitioner. Further, the jewellery of respondent No.2 was in possession of the petitioner and her family members, which was mortgaged with Muthoot Finance without consent of respondent No.2 and as such, offence under Section 406 of IPC is clearly established. The disputed question of facts can only be decided by learned trial Court on the basis of evidence to be adduced before it.

4. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and after perusing the record of the case with their able assistance, this Court finds no merit in

2024:PHHC:076698



the present petition as the disputed questions of fact can be determined only on the basis of the evidence led by the parties. The probable defence set up by the petitioner in the present petition cannot be appreciated at this stage.

5. A two Judge Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***HMT Watches Limited Vs. M.A. Abida, (2015) 11 SCC 776*** has held that inherent powers under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. cannot be extended for determining question of facts. It is only for the trial Court to determine the disputed questions of fact, after examining the evidence on record and interference by this Court with regards to factual questions is impermissible in law.

6. Recently, in ***Neeharika Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. Vs. State of Maharastra, AIR 2021 SC 1918***, the Hon'ble Supreme Court reiterated the guiding principles to quash proceedings under Section 482 of Cr.P.C and held as follow-:

“80. In view of the above and for the reasons stated above, our final conclusions on the, whether the High Court would be justified in passing an interim order of stay of investigation and/or "no coercive steps to be adopted", during the pendency of the quashing petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C, 1973 and/or under Article 226 of the Constitution of India and in what circumstances and whether the High Court would be justified in passing the order of not to arrest the accused or "no coercive steps to be adopted" during the investigation or till the final report/chargesheet is filed under Section 173 Cr.P.C., 1973 while dismissing/disposing of/not entertaining/not quashing the criminal proceedings/complaint/FIR in exercise of powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C., 1973 and/or under

2024:PHHC:076698



Article 226 of the Constitution of India, our final conclusions are as under:

- i) Police has the statutory right and duty under the relevant provisions of the Code of Criminal Procedure contained in Chapter XIV of the Code to investigate into a cognizable offence;*
- ii) Courts would not thwart any investigation into the cognizable offences;*
- iii) It is only in cases where no cognizable offence or offence of any kind is disclosed in the first information report that the Court will not permit an investigation to go on;*
- iv) The power of quashing should be exercised sparingly with circumspection, as it has been observed, in the `rarest of rare cases (not to be confused with the formation in the context of death penalty).*
- v) While examining an FIR/complaint, quashing of which is sought, the court cannot embark upon an enquiry as to the reliability or genuineness or otherwise of the allegations made in the FIR/complaint;*
- vi) Criminal proceedings ought not to be scuttled at the initial stage;*
- vii) Quashing of a complaint/FIR should be an exception rather than an ordinary rule;*
- viii) Ordinarily, the courts are barred from usurping the jurisdiction of the police, since the two organs of the State operate in two specific spheres of activities and one ought not to tread over the other sphere;*
- ix) The functions of the judiciary and the police are complementary, not overlapping;*
- x) Save in exceptional cases where non-interference would result in miscarriage of justice, the Court and the judicial process should not interfere at the stage of investigation of offences;*
- xi) Extraordinary and inherent powers of the Court*

2024:PHHC:076698



do not confer an arbitrary jurisdiction on the Court to act according to its whims or caprice;

xii) The first information report is not an encyclopaedia which must disclose all facts and details relating to the offence reported. Therefore, when the investigation by the police is in progress, the court should not go into the merits of the allegations in the FIR. Police must be permitted to complete the investigation. It would be premature to pronounce the conclusion based on hazy facts that the complaint/FIR does not deserve to be investigated or that it amounts to abuse of process of law. After investigation, if the investigating officer finds that there is no substance in the application made by the complainant, the investigating officer may file an appropriate report/summary before the learned Magistrate which may be considered by the learned Magistrate in accordance with the known procedure;

xiii) The power under Section 482 Cr.P.C., 1973 is very wide, but conferment of wide power requires the court to be more cautious. It casts an onerous and more diligent duty on the court;

xiv) However, at the same time, the court, if it thinks fit, regard being had to the parameters of quashing and the self restraint imposed by law, more particularly the parameters laid down by this Court in the cases of R.P. Kapur (supra) and Bhajan Lal (supra), has the jurisdiction to quash the FIR/complaint;

xv) When a prayer for quashing the FIR is made by the alleged accused and the court when it exercises the power under Section 482 Cr.P.C., 1973 only has to consider whether the allegations in the FIR disclose commission of a cognizable offence or not. The court is not required to consider on merits whether or not the merits of the allegations make

2024:PHHC:076698



out a cognizable offence and the court has to permit the investigating agency/police to investigate the allegations in the FIR;

xvi) The aforesaid parameters would be applicable and/or the aforesaid aspects are required to be considered by the High Court while passing an interim order in a quashing petition in exercise of powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C., 1973 and/or under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. However, an interim order of stay of investigation during the pendency of the quashing petition can be passed with circumspection. Such an interim order should not require to be passed routinely, casually and/or mechanically. Normally, when the investigation is in progress and the facts are hazy and the entire evidence/material is not before the High Court, the High Court should restrain itself from passing the interim order of not to arrest or "no coercive steps to be adopted" and the accused should be relegated to apply for anticipatory bail under Section 438 Cr.P.C., 1973 before the competent court. The High Court shall not and as such is not justified in passing the order of not to arrest and/or "no coercive steps" either during the investigation or till the investigation is completed and/or till the final report/chargesheet is filed under Section 173 Cr.P.C., 1973 while dismissing/disposing of the quashing petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C., 1973 and/or under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

xvii) Even in a case where the High Court is prima facie of the opinion that an exceptional case is made out for grant of interim stay of further investigation, after considering the broad parameters while exercising the powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C., 1973 and/or under Article 226 of the Constitution of India referred to hereinabove, the High Court has to

2024:PHHC:076698



give brief reasons why such an interim order is warranted and/or is required to be passed so that it can demonstrate the application of mind by the Court and the higher forum can consider what was weighed with the High Court while passing such an interim order.


xviii) Whenever an interim order is passed by the High Court of "no coercive steps to be adopted" within the aforesaid parameters, the High Court must clarify what does it mean by "no coercive steps to be adopted" as the term "no coercive steps to be adopted" can be said to be too vague and/or broad which can be misunderstood and/or misapplied."

7. Therefore, in light of the above discussion, this Court cannot delve into disputed questions of fact and examine the probable defence taken by the petitioner in the present petition, while invoking the power under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. Accordingly, present petition is dismissed.

8. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed as expression of opinion of this Court on merits of the case and learned trial Court shall proceed without being prejudiced by observations of this Court and shall decide the case on its own merits, strictly in accordance with law.

9. Since the petitioner is household lady and she is resident of Delhi and attending trial on each and every date would cause great inconvenience and hardship to her, therefore, in view of the ratio laid down by this Court in CRM-M-25963-2023 titled as ***Suresh Kumar and another Vs. The State of Haryana and another, 2023 (2) Law Herald 1498***, personal appearance of the petitioner before learned trial Court is ordered to

2024:PHHC:076698



be exempted, subject to the following conditions:-

- i) petitioner shall be represented through her counsel;*
- ii) shall not delay/stall the trial proceedings;*
- iii) shall not dispute her identity as accused;*
- iv) shall have no objection if the prosecution evidence is recorded in her absence but in the presence of her counsel;*
- v) shall appear before the trial Court as and when required; and*
- vi) any other condition, which the trial Court may impose.*

29.05.2024
vishnu

[HARPREET SINGH BRAR]
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable:	Yes/No