



Judgment

425 revn207.24

1

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY,
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR.**

CRIMINAL REVISION APPLICATION NO.207 OF 2024

Ku.Karishma d/o Vijay Sharma,
aged about 28 years,
occupation education.
r/o Sunrise Guest House,
Ramdaspath, Akola, taluka and district
Akola. **Applicant.**

:: VERSUS ::

State of Maharashtra,
through Police Station Officer,
Police Station Pinjar,
taluka Barshitakli, district Akola. **Non-applicant.**

**Shri K.R.Giripunje, Counsel and Shri S.V.Sirpurkar,
Advocate for the Applicant.
Shri Anant Ghongre, Additional Public Prosecutor for the
State.
Shri N.R.Tekade, Counsel for the Intervenor.**

CORAM : URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE, J.
CLOSED ON : 02/07/2025
PRONOUNCED ON : 08/07/2025

JUDGMENT

2

1. Heard learned counsel Shri K.R.Giripunje for the applicant, learned Additional Public Prosecutor Shri Anant Ghongre for the State, and learned counsel Shri N.R.Tekade for the Intervenor. **Rule.** Heard finally by consent.

2. The present revision application is filed by the applicant, who is original accused, in connection with Crime No.225/2019 registered under Section 306 of the IPC with the non-applicant/police station, against rejection of discharge application filed at Exh.13 under Section 227 of the CrPC.

3. Factual matrix of the case is as under:

Amit Jaiprakash Sanwal (the deceased) committed suicide by jumping into dam of Mahan, taluka Barshitakli, district Akola on 23.9.2019 and, therefore, merg was registered with the non-applicant/police station bearing

3

No.21/2019 and enquiry under Section 174 of the CrPC was initiated. During the enquiry, it revealed that there was extra-marital relationship between the deceased and the applicant. The applicant was insisting him to perform marriage though she was aware that the deceased is married. It is further alleged that the applicant was harassing the deceased by demanding money for purchasing valuables. As the deceased was continuously pressurized for money and performing marriage with her, he committed suicide by jumping into the said dam. On the basis of the said investigation, the crime was registered against the applicant. After registration of the crime, investigation was carried out and statements of relevant witnesses were recorded. After completion of the investigation, chargesheet was filed against the applicant. The applicant preferred an application vide Exh.13 for discharge on the ground that on the basis of vague

4

allegations, she is arraigned as an accused alleging that she abetted the deceased to commit suicide. In fact, the entire investigation papers nowhere make out case of abetment contemplated under Section 107 of the IPC. As no *prima case* is made out, no purpose will be served by forcing the applicant to face charges.

4. Learned counsel for the applicant reiterated said contentions and took me through the entire investigation papers and submitted that the prosecution placed reliance on statements of some witnesses which only disclose that there was friendship between the applicant and the deceased. At the most, it shows that there was extra-marital relationship between both of them, but it nowhere discloses that in what manner the applicant has abetted the deceased to commit suicide. The witnesses do not

5

have personal knowledge about insistence by the applicant for the marriage.

To attract Section 306 of the IPC, two basic ingredients that an act of suicide by one person and abetment by another person are to be established.

In order to sustain a charge under Section 306 of the Indian Penal Code, it must necessarily be proved that the accused person has contributed to the suicide by the deceased by some direct or indirect act. Abetment involves a mental process of instigating or intentionally aiding another person to do a particular thing. To bring a charge under Section 306 of the Indian Penal Code, the act of abetment would require the positive act of instigating or intentionally aiding another person to commit suicide. Without such *mens rea* on the part of the accused person being apparent from the face of the

6

record, a charge under the aforesaid Section cannot be sustained.

5. *Per contra*, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State submitted that at the time of framing of charge, a strong suspicion is also sufficient to frame charge. Whether there was requisite *mens rea* or not is a matter of evidence. The statements of witnesses, who are friends of the deceased, disclosed involvement of the applicant in the abetment. At the stage of framing of charge, the court is required to evaluate the material and documents on record with a view to find out if the facts emerging therefrom taken at their face value disclose existence of ingredients or not. Thus, at this stage, the material collected during investigation is sufficient to frame the charge and, therefore, no interference is called for.

7

6. Before entering into merits of the case, it is necessary to see what are considerations for considering the application for discharge.

7. It is a settled principle of law that at the stage of considering an application for discharge, the court must proceed on the assumption that the material which has been brought on record by the prosecution is true and evaluate the material in order to determine whether the facts emerging from the material, taken on its face value, disclose the existence of the ingredients necessary of the offence alleged.

8. The Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **State of Gujarat vs. Dilipsinh Kishorsinh Rao, reported in MANU/SC/1113 2023**, advertng to the earlier propositions of law in its earlier decisions in the cases of **State of Tamil Nadu vs. N.Suresh Rajan and ors, reported**

8

in (2014) 11 SCC 709 and **The State of Maharashtra vs. Som Nath Thapa**, reported in (1996) 4 SCC 659 and **The State of MP Vs. Mohan Lal Soni**, reported in (2000) 6 SCC 338, has held as under:

“10. It is settled principle of law that at the stage of considering an application for discharge the court must proceed on an assumption that the material which has been brought on record by the prosecution is true and evaluate said material in order to determine whether the facts emerging from the material taken on its face value, disclose the existence of the ingredients necessary of the offence alleged. This Court in **State of Tamil Nadu vs. N.Suresh Rajan and ors**, (2014) 11 SCC 709 adverting to the earlier propositions of law laid down on this subject has held:

"29. We have bestowed our consideration to the rival submissions and the submissions made by Mr. Ranjit Kumar commend us. True

9

it is that at the time of consideration of the applications for discharge, the court cannot act as a mouthpiece of the prosecution or act as a post office and may sift evidence in order to find out whether or not the allegations made are groundless so as to pass an order of discharge. It is trite that at the stage of consideration of an application for discharge, the court has to proceed with an assumption that the materials brought on record by the prosecution are true and evaluate the said materials and documents with a view to find out whether the facts emerging therefrom taken at their face value disclose the existence of all the ingredients constituting the alleged offence. At this stage, probative value of the materials has to be gone into and the court is not expected to go deep into the matter and hold that the materials would not warrant a conviction. In our opinion, what needs to be considered is whether there is a ground for presuming that the offence has been

10

committed and not whether a ground for convicting the accused has been made out. To put it differently, if the court thinks that the accused might have committed the offence on the basis of the materials on record on its probative value, it can frame the charge; though for conviction, the court has to come to the conclusion that the accused has committed the offence. The law does not permit a mini trial at this stage."

9. Thus, the defence of the accused is not to be looked into at this stage when the application is filed for discharge. The expression "the record of the case" used in Section 227 of the Code of Criminal Procedure is to be understood as the documents and materials, if any, produced by the prosecution. The provisions of the Code of Criminal Procedure does not give any right to the accused to produce any document at the stage of framing

11

of the charge. The submission of the accused is to be confined to the material produced by the investigating agency. The primary consideration at the stage of framing of charge is the test of existence of a *prima facie* case, and at this stage, the probative value of materials on record need not be gone into. At the stage of entertaining the application for discharge under Section 227 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the court cannot analyze or direct the evidence of the prosecution and defence or the points or possible cross examination of the defence. The case of the prosecution is to be accepted as it is.

10. In the case of **Union of India vs. Prafulla Kumar Samal and anr**, reported in (1973)3 SCC 4, the Hon'ble Apex Court considered the scope of Section 227 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. After advertng to the

12

various decisions, the Hon'ble Apex Court has enumerated the following principles:

“(1) That the Judge while considering the question of framing the charges under section 227 of the Code has the undoubted power to sift and weigh the evidence for the limited purpose of finding out whether or not a prima facie case against the accused has been made out.

(2) Where the materials placed before the Court disclose grave suspicion against the accused which has not been properly explained the Court will be, fully justified in framing a charge and proceeding with the trial.

(3) The test to determine a prima facie case would naturally depend upon the facts of each case and it is difficult to lay down a rule of universal

13

application. By and large however if two views are equally possible and the Judge is satisfied that the evidence produced before him while giving rise to some suspicion but not grave suspicion against the accused, he will be fully within his right to discharge the accused.

(4) That in exercising his jurisdiction under section 227 of the Code the Judge which under the present Code is a senior and experienced Judge cannot act merely as a Post office or a mouth-piece of the prosecution, but has to consider the broad probabilities of the case, the total effect of the evidence and the documents produced before the Court, any basic infirmities appearing in the case and so on. This however does not mean that the Judge should make a roving enquiry into the pros

14

and cons of the matter and weigh the evidence as if he was conducting a trial.”

11. With above principles, if the material in the present case collected during the investigation is discussed, there is no dispute as to the fact that there was extra-marital relationship between the deceased and the applicant. The applicant was aware that the deceased is married. It is alleged that the applicant was insisting the deceased to perform the marriage.

For that purpose, the prosecution placed reliance on statements of Majar Khan Bismillah Khan, Atish Vijay Avchar, and Gourav Gopal Sharma, which state to the extent that the deceased was introduced to them by the applicant. It was the applicant who disclosed to them that she is having love affair with the deceased and they would perform marriage.

15

The statement of Majar Khan further shows that the applicant was upset as the deceased did not pay amount Rs.2.00 lacs and she was demanding the money from the deceased from time to time.

The statement of another witnesses are on the similar lines.

As far as allegation, as to the extra-marital relationship is concerned, the entire prosecution case rested upon statements of these witnesses.

12. Now, question remains, whether having extra-marital relationship and demanding money or insisting for marriage are sufficient to say that the applicant abetted the deceased to commit suicide.

16

13. Section 306 (Section 108 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023) of the Indian Penal Code defines abetment of suicide, which reads thus:

306. Abetment of suicide. - If any person commits suicide, whoever abets the commission of such suicide, shall be punished with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to ten years, and shall also be liable to fine.

Classification of offence. - The offence under this section is cognizable, non-bailable, non-compoundable and triable by Court of Session.

14. Section 107 of the Indian Penal Code (Section 45 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023) defines abetment of a thing, which reads thus:

107. Abetment of a thing. A person abets the doing of a thing, who—

First.—Instigates any person to do that thing; or

Secondly.—Engages with one or more other person or persons in any conspiracy for the doing

17

of that thing, if an act or illegal omission takes place in pursuance of that conspiracy, and in order to the doing of that thing; or

Thirdly.—Intentionally aids, by any act or illegal omission, the doing of that thing.

Explanation 1.—A person who, by wilful misrepresentation, or by wilful concealment of a material fact which he is bound to disclose, voluntarily causes or procures, or attempts to cause or procure, a thing to be done, is said to instigate the doing of that thing.

Illustration

A, a public officer, is authorised by a warrant from a Court of Justice to apprehend Z, B, knowing that fact and also that C is not Z, wilfully represents to A that C is Z, and thereby intentionally causes A to apprehend C. Here B abets by instigation the apprehension of C.

Explanation 2.—Whoever, either prior to or at the time of the commission of an act, does anything in order to facilitate the commission of that act, and thereby facilitates the commission thereof, is said to aid the doing of that act.

18

15. Section 108 of the Indian Penal reads thus:

108. Abettor.—

A person abets an offence, who abets either the commission of an offence, or the commission of an act which would be an offence, if committed by a person capable by law of committing an offence with the same intention or knowledge as that of the abettor.

Explanation 1.— The abetment of the illegal omission of an act may amount to an offence although the abettor may not himself be bound to do that act.

Explanation 2.— To constitute the offence of abetment it is not necessary that the act abetted should be committed, or that the effect requisite to constitute the offence should be caused.

Illustrations

19

(a) A instigates B to murder C. B refuses to do so. A is guilty of abetting B to commit murder.

(b) A instigates B to murder D. B in pursuance of the instigation stabs D. D recovers from the wound. A is guilty of instigating B to commit murder.

Explanation 3.— It is not necessary that the person abetted should be capable by law of committing an offence, or that he should have the same guilty intention or knowledge as that of the abettor, or any guilty intention or knowledge.

Illustrations

(a) A, with a guilty intention, abets a child or a lunatic to commit an act which would be an offence, if committed by a person capable by law of committing an offence, and having the same intention as A. Here A, whether the act be committed or not, is guilty of abetting an offence.

20

(b) A, with the intention of murdering Z, instigates B, a child under seven years of age, to do an act which causes Z's death. B, in consequence of the abetment, does the act in the absence of A and thereby causes Z's death. Here, though B was not capable by law of committing an offence, A is liable to be punished in the same manner as if B had been capable by law of committing an offence, and had committed murder, and he is therefore subject to the punishment of death.

(c) A instigates B to set fire to a dwelling-house, B, in consequence of the unsoundness of his mind, being incapable of knowing the nature of the act, or that he is doing what is wrong or contrary to law, sets fire to the house in consequence of A's instigation. B has committed no offence, but A is guilty of abetting the offence of setting fire to a dwelling-house, and is liable to the punishment, provided for that offence.

21

(d) A, intending to cause a theft to be committed, instigates B to take property belonging to Z out of Z's possession. A induces B to believe that the property belongs to A. B takes the property out of Z's possession, in good faith, believing it to be A's property. B, acting under this misconception, does not take dishonestly, and therefore does not commit theft. But A is guilty of abetting theft, and is liable to the same punishment as if B had committed theft.

Explanation 4.— The abetment of an offence being an offence, the abetment of such an abetment is also an offence.

Illustration

A instigates B to instigate C to murder Z. B accordingly instigates C to murder Z, and C commits that offence in consequence of B's instigation. B is liable to be punished for his offence with the punishment for murder; and, as A

22

instigated B to commit the offence, A is also liable to the same punishment.

Explanation 5.— It is not necessary to the commission of the offence of abetment by conspiracy that the abettor should concert the offence with the person who commits it. It is sufficient if he engages in the conspiracy in pursuance of which the offence is committed.

Illustration

A concerts with B a plan for poisoning Z. It is agreed that A shall administer the poison. B then explains the plan to C mentioning that a third person is to administer the poison, but without mentioning A's name. C agrees to procure the poison, and procures and delivers it to B for the purpose of its being used in the manner explained. A administers the poison; Z dies in consequence. Here, though A and C have not conspired together, yet C has been engaged in the conspiracy in

23

pursuance of which Z has been murdered. C has therefore committed the offence defined in this section and is liable to the punishment for murder.

16. Section 306 of the Indian Penal Code talks about abetment of suicide and states that whoever abets the commission of suicide of another person, he/she shall be punished with imprisonment of either description for a term not exceeding ten years and shall also be liable to fine.

The said Sections penalizes abetment of commission of suicide. To charge someone under this Section, the prosecution must prove that the accused played a role in the suicide. Specifically, the accused's actions must align with one of the three criteria detailed in Section 107 of the Indian Penal Code. This means the accused either encouraged the individual to take their life,

24

conspired with others to ensure the person committed suicide.

17. A question arises as to when a person said to have instigated another. The word “instigate” means to goad or urge forward, provoke, incite or encourage to do “an act” which the person otherwise would not have done.

18. It is well settled that in order to amount to abetment, there must be *mens rea*. Without knowledge or intention, there cannot be any abetment. The knowledge and intention must relate to the act said to be abetted which in this case, is the act of committing suicide. Therefore, in order to constitute abetment, there must be direct incitement to do culpable act.

19. In **SLP (Cri.) Diary No.39981/2022 (Prabhu vs. The State represented by the Inspector of Police and anr)**

25

decided by the Hon'ble Apex Court on 30.1.2024, it is held that the physical relationship over a considerable period of time was out of mutual love between the appellant and the deceased and not based on the promise of marriage. In the said case, the Hon'ble Apex Court has considered its earlier decision in the case of **Kamlakar vs. State of Karnataka (Criminal Appeal No.1485/of 2011, decided on 12.10.2023** and explained ingredients of Section 306 of the Indian Penal Code and held, as under:

"8.2. Section 306 IPC penalizes abetment of commission of suicide. To charge someone under this Section, the prosecution must prove that the accused played a role in the suicide. Specifically, the accused's actions must align with one of the three criteria detailed in Section 107 IPC. This means the accused either encouraged the individual to take their life, conspired with others to ensure the person committed suicide, or acted in

26

a way (or failed to act) which directly resulted in the person's suicide.

8.3. In **Ramesh Kumar vs. State of Chattisgarh, reported in AIR 2001 SC 383**, this Court has analysed different meanings of “instigation”. The relevant para of the said judgment is reproduced herein:

“20. Instigation is to goad, urge forward, provoke, incite or encourage to do “an act”. To satisfy the requirement of instigation though it is not necessary that actual words must be used to that effect or what constitutes instigation must necessarily and specifically be suggestive of the consequence. Yet a reasonable certainty to incite the consequence must be capable of being spelt out. The present one is not a case where the accused had by his acts or omission or by a continued course of conduct created such circumstances that the deceased was left with no other option except to commit suicide

27

in which case an instigation may have been inferred. A word uttered in the heat of anger or emotion without intending the consequences to actually follow cannot be said to be instigation.”

8.4. The essentials of Section 306 IPC were elucidated by this Court in **M.Mohan vs. State, AIR 2011 SC 1238**, as under:

“43. This Court in **Chitresh Kumar Chopra v. State (Govt. of NCT of Delhi) [(2009) 16 SCC 605 : (2010) 3 SCC (Cri) 367]** had an occasion to deal with this aspect of abetment. The Court dealt with the dictionary meaning of the word “instigation” and “goading”. The Court opined that there should be intention to provoke, incite or encourage the doing of an act by the latter. Each person's suicidability pattern is different from the others. Each person has his own idea of

28

selfesteem and selfrespect. Therefore, it is impossible to lay down any straitjacket formula in dealing with such cases. Each case has to be decided on the basis of its own facts and circumstances.

44. Abetment involves a mental process of instigating a person or intentionally aiding a person in doing of a thing. Without a positive act on the part of the accused to instigate or aid in committing suicide, conviction cannot be sustained.

45. The intention of the legislature and the ratio of the cases decided by this Court are clear that in order to convict a person under Section 306 IPC there has to be a clear mens rea to commit the offence. It also requires an active act or direct act which led the deceased to commit suicide seeing no option and this act must have been intended to push the deceased into

29

such a position that he/she committed suicide.”

8.5. The essential ingredients which are to be meted out in order to bring a case under Section 306 IPC were also discussed in **Amalendu Pal alias Jhantu vs. West bengal AIR 2010 SC 512**, in the following paragraphs:

“12. Thus, this Court has consistently taken the view that before holding an accused guilty of an offence under Section 306 IPC, the court must scrupulously examine the facts and circumstances of the case and also assess the evidence adduced before it in order to find out whether the cruelty and harassment meted out to the victim had left the victim with no other alternative but to put an end to her life. It is also to be borne in mind that in cases of alleged abetment of suicide there must be proof of direct or

30

indirect acts of incitement to the commission of suicide. Merely on the allegation of harassment without there being any positive action proximate to the time of occurrence on the part of the accused which led or compelled the person to commit suicide, conviction in terms of Section 306 IPC is not sustainable.

13. In order to bring a case within the purview of Section 306 IPC there must be a case of suicide and in the commission of the said offence, the person who is said to have abetted the commission of suicide must have played an active role by an act of instigation or by doing certain act to facilitate the commission of suicide. Therefore, the act of abetment by the person charged with the said offence must be proved and established by the

31

prosecution before he could be convicted under Section 306 IPC.”

8.6. On a careful reading of the factual matrix of the instant case and the law regarding Section 306 IPC, there seems to be no proximate link between the marital discord between the deceased and the appellant and her subsequent death by burning herself. The appellant has not committed any positive or direct act to instigate or aid in the commission of suicide by the deceased.”

20. In the case of **Sanju @ Sanjay Singh Sengar v. State of M.P.**, reported in (2002) 5 SCC 371, the Hon’ble Apex Court extensively dealt with concept of 'abetment' in the context of the offence punishable under Section 306 of the Indian Penal Code. In that case, the allegation against the accused/appellant therein was that he had abetted the commission of suicide of his sister's husband one Chander

32

Bhushan. The facts reveals that there were matrimonial disputes between sister of the appellant/accused and her husband and in connection with the said disputes, the appellant had allegedly threatened and abused Chander Bhushan. Chander Bhushan committed suicide and the suicide was attributed by the prosecution to the quarrel that had taken place between the appellant and the said Chander Bhushan, a day prior. It was alleged that the appellant had used abusive language against said Chander Bhushan and had told him "to go and die". The appellant, who had been chargesheeted for an offence punishable under Section 306 of the Indian Penal Code, filed a Petition under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, for quashing the proceedings against him, but his Petition was dismissed by the High Court. While allowing the appeal, the Hon'ble Apex Court, *inter alia*, observed as follows:

33

"Even if we accept the prosecution story that the appellant did tell the deceased 'to go and die', that itself does not constitute the ingredient of 'instigation'. The word 'instigate' denotes incitement or urging to do some drastic or unadvisable action or to stimulate or incite. Presence of mens rea, therefore, is the necessary concomitant of instigation."

21. Thus, a direct influence or an oblique impact with the acts or utterances of the accused caused or created in the mind of the deceased and which draw him to suicide will not be sufficient to constitute offence of abetment of suicide. A fatal impulse or ill-fated thoughts of the suicide, however unfortunate and touchy it may be, cannot fray the fabric of the provision contained in Section 306 of the Indian Penal Code. In order to bring out an offence under Section 306 of the Indian Penal Code specific abetment as contemplated by Section 306 of

34

the Indian Penal Code on the part of the accused with an intention to bring about the suicide of the person concerned as a result of that abetment is required. The intention of the accused to aid or to instigate or to abet the deceased to commit suicide is a must for an offence under Section 306 of the Indian Penal Code.

22. The Hon'ble Apex Court in case of **Ramesh Kumar vs. State of Chattiness**, reported in AIR 2001 SC 383 referred in **Prabhu vs. The State represented by the Inspector of Police and anr** *supra*, in para No.20 has examined different meaning of 'instigation', which reads as, 'instigation' is to goad, urge forward, provoke, incite or encourage to do "an act". To satisfy the requirement of instigation though it is not necessary that actual words must be used to that effect or what constitutes instigation must necessarily and specifically be suggestive of the

35

consequence. Yet a reasonable certainty to incite the consequence must be capable of being spelt out. The present one is not a case where the accused had by his acts or omission or by a continued course of conduct created such circumstances that the deceased was left with no other option except to commit suicide in which case an instigation may have been inferred. A word uttered in the fit of anger or emotion without intending the consequences to actually follow cannot be said to be 'instigation'.

23. Thus, combine reading of Sections 306, 107, and 108 of the Indian Penal Code, shows the requirement is a positive act on the part of the accused to instigate or aid in committing suicide and in the absence of the same, the conviction cannot be sustained. There has to be a clear

36

intention to commit the offence for being held liable under Section 306 of Indian Penal Code.

24. The Hon'ble Apex Court, in the case of **Mariano Anto Bruno vs. State, reported in (2023)15 SCC 560** in the context of culpability under Section 306 of the Indian Penal Code, observed as under :

“45. ... It is also to be borne in mind that in cases of alleged abetment of suicide, there must be proof of direct or indirect acts of incitement to the commission of suicide. Merely on the allegation of harassment without there being any positive action proximate to the time of occurrence on the part of the accused which led or compelled the person to commit suicide, conviction in terms of Section 306 IPC is not sustainable.”

25. After going through the catena of decisions, it reveals that test that the court should adopt in these types of cases is to make an endeavour to ascertain on the basis

37

of the materials on record whether there is anything to indicate even prima facie that the accused intended the consequences of the act, i.e., suicide. To attract the provisions what is to be shown is that the accused have actually instigated or aided in the victim act of committing suicide. There must be direct or indirect incitement to the commission of suicide and the accused must be shown to have played an active role by an act of instigation or by doing certain act to facilitate the commission of suicide.

26. Applying the above principles to the facts of the present case and even accepting the case as it is, it reveals that allegation is that there was extra-marital relationship between the applicant and the deceased. Except statements of witnesses, there is no evidence on record to show that she was insisting for money and the deceased

38

time to time was paying her money. Even statements nowhere disclose that in their presence at any point of time the applicant has insisted for marriage. From the statement of the wife of the deceased, it revealed that she was threatened by the applicant. However, admittedly, she has not disclosed the said incident immediately after 23.9.2019 and, thereafter, the alleged incident has taken place on 23.9.2019. The statement of the wife of the deceased was recorded on 18.1.2020. Initially, a merg was registered and inquest panchanama was drawn. However, she has not made any complaint as to the said incident.

27. First clause of Section 107 of the Indian Penal Code lays down that a person, who abets the doing of a thing, is a person who instigates any person to do that thing. Therefore, 'instigation' to do a particular thing is

39

necessary for charging a person with abetment. even in cases where the victim commits suicide, which may be as a result of cruelty meted out to her, the Courts have always held that discord and differences in domestic life are quite common in society and that the commission of such an offence largely depends upon the mental state of the victim. Surely, until and unless some guilty intention on the part of the accused is established, it is ordinarily not possible to convict him for an offence under Section 306 of the Indian Penal Code. The only thing that simply saying somebody or asking him to marry itself would not amount to abetment or suicide.

As far as the demand of money is concerned, except bare words, admittedly, none of statements discloses that money was paid to the applicant by the deceased and, therefore, in such a situation, merely

40

because the deceased refused to marry her, that by itself would not amount to instigate or provoke the deceased to commit suicide.

28. A plain reading of Sections 107, 108, and 306 of the Indian Penal Code and applying it to the undisputed facts of the present case indicates that none of ingredients are attracted to the case in hand.

29. After having sifted weigh through the evidence on record and gone through investigation papers and considering materials on record, it is difficult to hold that inference of grave suspicion can be raised against the applicant on the basis of the evidence on record. The material appears to be insufficient for subjecting the applicant to trial. On the basis of the evidence on record, it cannot be stated that the material is sufficient for the prosecution to establish the charge against the applicant.

41

Subjecting the applicant to trial on the basis of the above said evidence would not only be a mere formality, but also abuse of process of law. Learned Sessions Judge ought to have appreciated this position while deciding the application for discharge. Learned Sessions Judge ought to have appreciated that ingredients of the offence under Section 306 are absent. Even, if it is assumed that the material collected by the prosecution is true, it would not be sufficient to establish the case of the prosecution and, therefore, the conducting of the trial against the applicant would be an empty formality. I am, therefore, of the view that the order impugned is liable to be set aside. Hence, I proceed to pass following order:

ORDER

(1) The Criminal Revision Application is **allowed**.

42

(2) The order dated 12.9.2024 passed below Exhibit-13 by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Akola in Sessions Trial No.117/2021 rejecting the discharge application is quashed and set aside.

(3) The applicant is hereby discharged of the offence under Section 306 of the Indian Penal Code in connection with Crime No.225/2019 registered with the non-applicant police station.

Revision stands **disposed of**.

(URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE, J.)

!! BrWankhede !!