

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.44861 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-592 Year-2023 Thana- PATNA COMPLAINT CASE District-
Patna

-
1. Rohit Agrawal Son of Motilal Agarwal
 2. Sanju Gupta Son of Om Prakash R/O- H-1421-1423-1424, Ground Floor, Millenium Textile Market, Police Station- Gopipura, Police Choki Ring Road, District- Surat, State- Gujrat

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Ranjan Kumar Gupta @ Pappu Kumar Gupta Son of Late Ganga Sao R/O- Jahaji Kothi, Abhishek Place, Ps-Kadamkuan, District- Patna

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Aarsh Kumar, Advocate
		Mr.Ravi Kant Tiwari, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr.Parmanand Kumar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PURNENDU SINGH
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 20-11-2025

Heard Mr. Aarsh Kumar along with Mr. Ravi Kant Tiwari, learned counsels appearing on behalf of the petitioners and Mr. Parmanand Kumar, learned APP for the State.

2. The present application has been preferred under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. for quashing of order taking cognizance dated 04.03.2023 passed by the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Patna in Complaint Case No.592(C) of 2023, whereby the cognizance has been taken under Sections 420, 406 & 120(B) of IPC.

3. The prosecution story in short is that the



complainant was appointed by the petitioners as the Salesman on salary of Rs.60,000/- per month and he started working in M/S Balajee Fabrics since 04.09.2022 but after lapse of one month, the complainant was paid only (Rs.30,000+15,000) Rs.45,000/- and the petitioner no.2 assured to pay the rest amount to the complainant but four months' salary of the complainant (approximately Rs.1,95,000/-) has not been paid.

4. Respective counsels are of the opinion that the matter primarily relates to monetary transaction between the parties.

5. Both the parties have referred to the materials/evidences which have surfaced in course of investigation, but they admit that the nature of allegation is civil in nature. They have arrived to inform this Court that they will try to settle the dispute amicably outside the Court.

6. Law in this regard is well settled by the Apex Court in the case of ***Paramjeet Batra v. State of Uttarakhand*** reported in ***(2013) 11 SCC 673***, in which, the Apex Court in paragraph no. 12 has held as follows:

"12. While exercising its jurisdiction under Section 482 of the Code the High Court has to be cautious. This power is to be used sparingly and only for the purpose of preventing abuse of the process of any court or otherwise to secure ends of justice. Whether a complaint discloses a criminal offence or not depends upon the nature of facts alleged therein. Whether essential ingredients of



criminal offence are present or not has to be judged by the High Court. A complaint disclosing civil transactions may also have a criminal texture. But the High Court must see whether a dispute which is essentially of a civil nature is given a cloak of criminal offence. In such a situation, if a civil remedy is available and is, in fact, adopted as has happened in this case, the High Court should not hesitate to quash the criminal proceedings to prevent abuse of process of the court."

7. The Apex Court has reiterated the aforesaid proposition in recent judgment of ***S. N. Vijayalakshmi & Ors. vrs. The State of Karnataka and Anr.*** reported in **(2025) SCC Online SC 1575**.

8. The Apex Court while considering the content of ingredients of Sections 406 and 420 of the Indian Penal Code in the case of ***Delhi Race Club (1940) Ltd. & Ors. vs. State of Uttar Pradesh & Anr. in Criminal Appeal No. 3114 of 2024***, after discussing the earlier law laid down in several cases, has observed in paragraphs nos. 35, 36 and 37, *inter alia* as follows:

Difference between criminal breach of trust and cheating

35. This Court in its decision in *S.W. Palanitkar v. State of Bihar* *S.W. Palanitkar v. State of Bihar*, (2002) 1 SCC 241 expounded the difference in the ingredients required for constituting of an offence of criminal breach of trust (Section 406 IPC) vis-à-vis the offence of cheating (Section 420). The relevant observations read as under :

"9. The ingredients in order to constitute a criminal breach of trust are : (i) entrusting a person with property or with any dominion over property; (ii) that person entrusted : (a) dishonestly misappropriating or converting that property to his own use; or (b) dishonestly using or disposing of that property or wilfully suffering any other person so to do in violation (i) of any direction of law



prescribing the mode in which such trust is to be discharged, (ii) of any legal contract made, touching the discharge of such trust.

10. The ingredients of an offence of cheating are : (i) there should be fraudulent or dishonest inducement of a person by deceiving him, (ii)(a) the person so deceived should be induced to deliver any property to any person, or to consent that any person shall retain any property; or (b) the person so deceived should be intentionally induced to do or omit to do anything which he would not do or omit if he were not so deceived; and (iii) in cases covered by (ii) (b), the act of omission should be one which causes or is likely to cause damage or harm to the person induced in body, mind, reputation or property.”

36. What can be discerned from the above is that the offences of criminal breach of trust (Section 406 IPC) and cheating (Section 420 IPC) have specific ingredients:

In order to constitute a criminal breach of trust (Section 406 IPC)

(1) There must be entrustment with person for property or dominion over the property, and

(2) The person entrusted:

(a) Dishonestly misappropriated or converted property to his own use, or

(b) Dishonestly used or disposed of the property or wilfully suffers any other person so to do in violation of:

(i) Any direction of law prescribing the method in which the trust is discharged; or

(ii) Legal contract touching the discharge of trust (see : S.W. Palanitkar [S.W. Palanitkar v. State of Bihar, (2002) 1 SCC 241.

Similarly, in respect of an offence under Section 420IPC, the essential ingredients are:

(1) Deception of any person, either by making a false or misleading representation or by other action or by omission;

(2) Fraudulently or dishonestly inducing any person to deliver any property, or

(3) The consent that any person shall retain any property and finally intentionally inducing that person to do or omit to do anything which he would not do or omit (see : Harmanpreet Singh Ahluwalia v. State of Punjab [Harmanpreet Singh Ahluwalia v. State of Punjab, (2009) 7



SCC 712.

37. Further, in both the aforesaid sections, mens rea i.e. intention to defraud or the dishonest intention must be present, and in the case of cheating it must be there from the very beginning or inception."

9. The dispute between the parties is purely civil in nature and the parties have willingly desired to appear before the learned District Court on 12.12.2025 at 10:30 AM, so that the matter can be referred to the District Mediation Centre.

10. Learned District Court is directed to take necessary steps to refer the matter before the learned Mediator of the District Mediation Center.

11. Learned Mediator of the District Mediation Center concerned shall make his/her best efforts to settle the dispute amicably and thereafter submit his/her report before the concerned learned District Court, well within a period of one month, till then, no coercive action shall be taken against the petitioners in connection with the aforesaid case.

12. In case of failure on the part of the petitioner to appear on 12.12.2025 before the learned District Court or any date fixed by the learned Mediator, the interim protection granted to the petitioner shall automatically lose its force.

13. In case, the parties fail to reconcile, then in that case, the learned District Court shall proceed with the trial.

14. In case, the parties resolve their dispute amicably,



then the proceeding is required to be dropped in light of the law laid down by the Apex Court as referred hereinabove.

15. Accordingly, the present quashing application stands disposed of.

(Purnendu Singh, J)

chn/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	21.11.2025
Transmission Date	21.11.2025

