

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.34348 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-47 Year-2021 Thana- MAHILA P.S. District- Patna

-
-
1. Kumari Suman W/o Bikash Kumar
 2. Bikash Kumar S/o Binod Kumar

Both are Resident of House No. 804/F-39, Vinit Sadan, Ratu Road, Adarsh Nagar, naya Toli, Pandra, Hehal, District- Ranchi, Jharkhand and Presently residing at A-211, Sri Sai Residency, TCI Chowk, Rourkela, 769004, Odisha

... .. Petitioners

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Archana Kumari, D/o Om Prakash, R/o Mohalla-Purani Jakkanpur (Janta Road), P.O.- G.P.O., P.S.- Gardanibagh, District- Patna

... .. Opposite Parties

Appearance :

For the Petitioners	:	Mr. Kumar Ravish, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Parmanand Kumar
For the Informant	:	Mr. Ranjay Kumar Singh, Advocate
		Mr. Wasi Mohammad, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDRA SHEKHAR JHA
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 05-03-2025

Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned APP for the State duly assisted by learned counsel appearing on behalf of the O.P. No.2.

2. The present application has been filed by the petitioners for quashing of the First Information Report (in short 'F.I.R.') of Mahila P.S. Case No.47 of 2021 dated



04.05.2021 registered under Sections 341, 323, 498-A, 506 , 509 of the Indian Penal Code (in short 'I.P.C.') as well as Sections 3 and 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act.

3. The allegation against the petitioners is to assault the informant along with other relative/family members due to non-fulfilment of demand of dowry and thus by committed cruelty upon O.P. No.2 on various occasions.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel appearing for petitioners that the petitioner no.1 is married sister-in-law of O.P. No.2 and petitioner no.2 is husband of petitioner no.1. It is pointed out that petitioner no.1 is living separately with petitioner no.2 being wife and husband and their marriage was solemnized much before the marriage of O.P. No.2 with brother of petitioner no.1. It is submitted that the implication appears *prima facie* only out of the relation, as petitioner no.1 is the sister of husband of O.P. No.2. It is also submitted that the allegation *qua* alleged cruelty appears very much general and omnibus and moreover the matter appears compromised between the parties against the permanent alimony of Rs.50,00,000/- (Rupees Fifty Lakhs only) and they also



decided to dissolve their marriage by way of mutual divorce. In support of his submission, the learned counsel referred to Annexure-R/1 of the counter affidavit, which was filed by opposite party no.2.

5. In view of aforesaid, it is submitted that in view of aforesaid fact as parties settled their dispute, continuing with present criminal proceeding before the trial court would only amount to abuse of the process of court of law. In support of his submission, learned counsel relied upon legal report of Hon'ble Supreme Court as available through **Abhishek vs. State of Madhya Pradesh** reported in **2023 SCC Online SC 1083**.

6. Mr. Ranjay Kumar Singh, learned counsel appearing on behalf of opposite party no.2 has affirmed the factum of compromise as submitted above by learned counsel appearing for petitioners.

7. It would be apposite to reproduce paragraph nos. **13, 14, 15, 16 & 17** of the **Abhishek's case (supra)**, which reads as under:

"13. Instances of a husband's family members filing a petition to quash criminal proceedings launched against them by his wife in the midst of matrimonial disputes are neither a rarity



nor of recent origin. Precedents aplenty abound on this score. We may now take note of some decisions of particular relevance. Recently, in *Kahkashan Kausar alias Sonam v. State of Bihar* [(2022) 6 SCC 599], this Court had occasion to deal with a similar situation where the High Court had refused to quash a FIR registered for various offences, including Section 498A IPC. Noting that the foremost issue that required determination was whether allegations made against the in-laws were general omnibus allegations which would be liable to be quashed, this Court referred to earlier decisions wherein concern was expressed over the misuse of Section 498A IPC and the increased tendency to implicate relatives of the husband in matrimonial disputes. This Court observed that false implications by way of general omnibus allegations made in the course of matrimonial disputes, if left unchecked, would result in misuse of the process of law. On the facts of that case, it was found that no specific allegations were made against the in-laws by the wife and it was held that allowing their prosecution in the absence of clear allegations against the in-laws would result in an abuse of the process of law. It was also noted that a criminal trial, leading to an eventual acquittal, would inflict severe scars upon the accused and such an exercise ought to be discouraged.

14. In *Preeti Gupta v. State of Jharkhand* [(2010) 7 SCC 667], this Court noted that the tendency to implicate the husband and all his immediate relations is also not uncommon in complaints filed under Section 498A IPC. It was observed that the Courts have to be extremely careful and cautious in dealing with these complaints and must take pragmatic realities into consideration while dealing with matrimonial cases, as allegations of harassment by husband's close relations, who were living in different cities and never visited or rarely visited the place where the complainant resided, would add an entirely different complexion and such allegations would have to be scrutinised with great care and circumspection.

15. Earlier, in *Neelu Chopra v. Bharti* [(2009) 10 SCC 184], this Court observed that the mere mention of statutory provisions and the language thereof, for lodging a complaint, is not the 'be all and end all' of the matter, as 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 the commission of that offence. These observations were made in the context of a matrimonial dispute involving Section 498A IPC.

16. Of more recent origin is the decision of this Court in *Mahmood Ali v. State of U.P. (Criminal Appeal No. 2341 of 2023, decided on 08.08.2023)* on the legal principles applicable apropos Section 482 Cr. P.C. Therein, it was observed that when an accused comes before the High Court, invoking either the inherent power under Section 482 Cr. P.C. or the 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 of wreaking vengeance, then in such circumstances, the High Court owes a duty to look into the FIR with care and a little more closely. It was further observed that it will not be 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 as, 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, to try and read between the lines.

17. In *State of Haryana and Ors. Vs. Bhajan Lal and Ors [(1992) Supp (1) SCC 335]*, this Court had set out, by way of illustration, the broad categories of cases in which the inherent power under Section 482 Cr. P.C. could be exercised. Para 102 of the decision reads as follows:

“102. In the backdrop of the interpretation of the various relevant provisions of the Code under Chapter XIV and of the principles of law enunciated by this Court in a series of decisions relating to the exercise of the extraordinary power under Article 226 or the inherent powers under Section 482 of the Code which we have extracted and reproduced above, we give the following categories of cases by way of illustration wherein such power could be exercised either to prevent abuse of the process of any court or otherwise to secure the ends of justice, though it may not be possible to lay down any precise, clearly defined and sufficiently channelised and inflexible guidelines or rigid formulae and to give an exhaustive list of myriad kinds of cases wherein such power should be exercised.

(1) Where the allegations made in the first information report or the complaint, even if they are taken at their face value and accepted in their entirety do not prima facie constitute any offence or make out a case against the accused.

(2) Where the allegations in the first information report and other materials, if any, accompanying the FIR do not disclose a cognizable offence, justifying an investigation by police officers under Section 156(1) of the Code except under an order of a Magistrate within the purview of Section 155(2) of the Code.

(3) Where the uncontroverted allegations made in the FIR or complaint and the evidence collected in support of the same do not disclose the commission of any offence and make out a case against the accused.

(4) Where, the allegations in the FIR do not constitute a cognizable offence but constitute only a non-cognizable



offence, no investigation is permitted by a police officer without an order of a Magistrate as contemplated under Section 155(2) of the Code.

(5) Where the allegations made in the FIR or complaint are so absurd and inherently improbable on the basis of which no prudent person can ever reach a just conclusion that there is sufficient ground for proceeding against the accused.

(6) Where there is an express legal bar engrafted in any of the provisions of the Code or the Act concerned (under which a criminal proceeding is instituted) to the institution and continuance of the proceedings and/or where there is a specific provision in the Code or the Act concerned, providing efficacious redress for the grievance of the aggrieved party.

(7) Where a criminal proceeding is manifestly attended with mala fide and/or where the proceeding is maliciously instituted with an ulterior motive for wreaking vengeance on the accused and with a view to spite him due to private and personal grudge.”

8. In view of aforesaid factual and legal submissions and by taking note of fact as petitioners are in-laws living separately and moreover, the dispute with O.P. No.2 appears compromised, therefore, in view of Abhishek case (supra), continuing with present criminal proceedings before the trial court would only amount to abuse of the process of court of law.

9. Accordingly, the F.I.R. of Mahila P.S. Case No.47 of 2021 dated 04.05.2021 with all its consequential proceedings emanating therefrom *qua* petitioners before the learned trial court is hereby quashed and set aside.



10. The application stands allowed.

11. Let a copy of the judgment be communicated to
the learned trial court forthwith.

(Chandra Shekhar Jha, J.)

Sanjeet/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	06-03-2025
Transmission Date	06-03-2025

