

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.22807 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-32 Year-2024 Thana- MAHILA P.S. District- Vaishali

Chanchal Kumari W/O Ranjit Kumar R/O Karanpur, Bochaha, P.S.- Bochaha,
Dist.- Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Alka Kumari W/O Chandan Kumar R/O Amritpur, P.S.- Vaishali, Dist.-
Vaishali

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Akshay Tripathi, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Md. Fahimuddin, APP
For the O.P. No.2	:	Ms. Nachiketa Jha, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PURNENDU SINGH
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 03-11-2025

Heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the
petitioner, learned APP for the State and learned counsel for the
opposite party no.2.

2. The present application has been filed under
Section 528 of BNSS for quashing the order taking cognizance
dated 20.11.2024 passed by the learned Sub Divisional Judicial
Magistrate, Vaishali at Hajipur in connection with Mahila P.S.
Case No.32/2024, by which learned Judicial Magistrate has
taken cognizance of offences under Sections 341, 323, 379, 498
A, 504, 506 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code and Sections 3 and
4 of the D.P. Act.

3. The allegation is of subjecting the informant –



opposite party no.2 to various sorts of torture due to non-fulfillment of the demand of the dowry.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submitted that the learned District Court has not considered that the materials available on record don't disclose any criminal element and without considering this fact, the order taking cognizance against the petitioner cannot sustain in the eye of law. He further submitted that O.P. No.2 was married with Chandan Kumar. This petitioner, who is the married sister-in-law (*Nanad*) of O.P. No.2 in absence of any specific allegation, unnecessarily she has been roped in a false criminal case. Learned counsel further submitted that marriage is a sacred ceremony but for little matrimonial skirmish between husband and wife, the parties are facing criminal prosecution for the reason they are in-laws. The learned District Court has not considered this aspect, which calls for interference of this Court.

5. *Per contra*, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the opposite party no. 2 submitted that the opposite party no. 2 is being harassed by the petitioner and as such, the present quashing application is fit to be dismissed.

6. Heard the parties.

7. It is commonly seen in the society that the entire



family members, as well as, relatives are made accused along with the husband to face criminal prosecution. The Apex Court has demarcated the manner in which the complaints are entertained by the learned District Court.

8. The law in respect of matrimonial dispute between husband and wife is well settled, at the same time, the Apex Court recently in the case of ***Navneesh Aggarwal & Ors. v. State of Haryana & Anr.*** reported in ***2025 INSC 963*** has held that the family members of husband should not be roped unnecessarily and face vexatious criminal trial.

9. Recently also, the Apex Court in the case of ***Mange Ram Vs. State of Madhya Pradesh & Another (Special Leave Petition (Criminal) No.10817 of 2024)***, in paragraph nos. 25, 31 and 32 has reiterated that in cases, particularly, related to dowry, opportunity be given to the parties first to reconcile, which *inter alia* are as follows:-

“25. This Court, in Dara Lakshmi Narayana vs. State of Telangana, (2025) 3 SCC 735, has made it clear that family members of the husband ought not to be unnecessarily roped into criminal proceedings arising out of matrimonial discord. The Court observed that it has become a recurring tendency to implicate every member of the husband’s family, irrespective of their role or actual involvement, merely because a dispute has arisen between the spouses. It was further held that where the allegations are bereft of specific particulars, and particularly where the relatives sought to be prosecuted are residing separately or have had no connection with the matrimonial home, allowing the



prosecution to proceed would amount to an abuse of the process of law. The Court noted that criminal law is not to be deployed as an instrument of harassment, and that judicial scrutiny must be exercised to guard against such misuse.

31. We also refer to Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab, (2012) 10 SCC 303 wherein this Court observed that where the High Court quashes a criminal proceeding having regard to the fact that the dispute between the offender and the victim has been settled, although the offences are not compoundable, it does so as in its opinion, continuation of criminal proceedings will be an exercise in futility and justice in the case demands that the dispute between the parties is put to an end and peace is restored, securing the ends of justice being the ultimate guiding factor. In this regard, a specific reference was made to offences arising out of matrimony, particularly relating to dowry, etc. or a family dispute, where the wrong is basically to the victim but the offender and the victim have settled all disputes between them amicably, irrespective of the fact that such offences have not been made compoundable. The High Court may, within the framework of its inherent power, quash the criminal proceeding or criminal complaint or FIR if it is satisfied that on the face of such settlement, there is hardly any likelihood of the offender being convicted and by not quashing the criminal proceedings, justice shall be casualty and ends of justice shall be defeated.

32. In Naushey Ali vs. State of U.P., (2025) 4 SCC 78, one of us (Viswanathan, J.) observed in paragraph 32 that proceeding with the trial, when the parties have amicably resolved the dispute, would be futile and the ends of justice require that the settlement be given effect to by quashing the proceedings. It would be a grave abuse of process particularly when the dispute is settled and resolved.”

10. From perusal of the complaint, it is evident that there is no specific allegation against the petitioner (*Nanand*) of the opposite party no. 2, I find that no case under Sections 341, 323, 379, 498 A, 504, 506 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code and



Sections 3 and 4 of the D.P. Act is made out against the petitioner. Accordingly, the entire proceeding and the order taking cognizance dated 20.11.2024 in connection with Mahila P.S. Case No.32/2024, is hereby **set aside and quashed**.

11. The present application stands disposed of.

(Purnendu Singh, J)

Ashishsingh/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	05.11.2025
Transmission Date	05.11.2025

