IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

W.P. (Cr.) (D.B.) No.666 of 2026

---

1. Charanjit Singh Sethi s/o Late Shri Gurbaksh Singh Sethi, aged about 81 years.
2. Jaspal Kaur Sethi w/o Charanjit Singh Sethi, aged about 69 years,
3. Gurmeet Singh Sethi @ Gurneet Singh Sethi s/o Charanjit Singh Sethi, aged about 37 years,

All r/o SV 2(4), Second Floor, ELDECO UTOPIA Apartment, Sec. 93, Noida, P.O. Maha Rishi Nagar, P.S.: Phase 2, Noida, Dist. Gautam Budh Nagar, Uttar Pradesh. **…. …. Petitioners**

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand
2. The Officer in Charge, A.H.T.U. P.S., P.S. A.H.T.U., P.O. Chaibasa, Dist. West Singhbhum
3. Birsa Kairi Purti @ Geeta Kumari s/o Late Martin Purti, r/o Village Karla, P.O. Hesadih, P.S. Tebo, Dist. West Singhbhum

…. …. Respondents

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Rongon Mukhopadhyay
Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ram Sharma

For the Petitioners : Mr. Jitendra S. Singh, Sr. Advocate
: Ms. Rishi Bharati, Advocate
For the Respondent No.3 : Mr. Abhijeet Kumar, Advocate

02/04.11.2026 Heard Mr. Jitendra S. Singh, learned senior counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Abhijeet Kumar, learned counsel appearing for the respondent No.3.

In this writ application the petitioner has prayed for quashing of the entire criminal proceedings in connection with AHTU P.S. Case No.1/2026 registered to the offences under Sections 143(4), 146, 127, 115(2) of the BNS, 2023, Section 14(1)(a) of the Child Labour Prohibition and Regularization Act and Section 79 of the J.J. Act, 2015.

The prosecution case reveals that about 18 years ago in July, 2008, one Juel had taken away the informant to Delhi without her parents' consent and had sold her to the petitioner Nos.1 and 2 in Delhi who were residing at Ashok Vihar, New Delhi. It has been alleged that the informant wanted to go home but she was not allowed and was confined in a room without food. The informant was made to work like a bonded

labour from 6 am to midnight and she was also not allowed to study. Further allegation has been levelled that though the salary was fixed at Rs.15,000/- per month but in her account only an amount of Rs.4,22,651/- is existing while the remaining amount has not been paid to her despite having worked in the house of the petitioners from July, 2008 to 30.04.2026. The informant with the help of an NGO, managed to free herself on 30.04.2026 after which the First Information Report was instituted.

It has been submitted by Mr. Jitendra S. Singh, learned senior counsel for the petitioners that the brother of the informant on account of some miscommunication had earlier given an information to the Noida police on 29.04.2026 that the informant was being made to work as a bonded labour. It has been submitted that the informant was engaged as a domestic help sometimes in 2010 by a placement agency by the name of *Adiwasi Gharelu Kaamgaar Sewa Sanstha* which was being operated by one David. It has been submitted that the salary of the informant was being collected by David and in 2017-18, the said David disappeared and his whereabouts could not be ascertained as a result of which, the informant was made to open her own bank account with the HDFC Bank, where her salary was being regularly credited on a monthly basis. The petitioners had also ensured that the informant has a health policy with HDFC ERGO and a Fixed Deposit Account was also opened which would indicate that the informant was treated well by the petitioners. Mr. Singh, learned senior counsel further submits that the matter has been settled between the petitioners and the informant and an amount of Rs.15,00,000/- (Rupees Fifteen Lakhs) has already been credited to the account of the informant towards the balance wages and it has been agreed that the balance amount of Rs.5,00,000/- (Rupees Five Lakhs) shall be handed over to the informant on quashment of AHTU P.S. Case No.1/2026. It has been submitted by Mr. Singh that he has in his possession a demand draft of an amount of Rs.5,00,000/- (Rupees Five Lakhs) drawn in the name of the informant.

Mr. Abhijeet Kumar, learned counsel appearing for the informant has accepted the factum of compromise, and has further submitted that on account of a misunderstanding, the informant had instituted the case, but since now, a compromise has been effective and the balance wages have already been credited to her account, the informant does not have any grievance against the petitioners and also does not object to the quashment of the entire criminal proceedings lodged against the petitioners.

In the backdrop of the submissions advanced by the learned counsel for the respective parties, the settlement deed dated 26.09.2026 has been perused and it appears that there was some dispute with respect to the payment of wages which however has been settled between the parties, for which an amount of Rs.15,00,000/- (Rupees Fifteen Lakhs) has already been credited to the account of the informant.

The sequence of events as submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioners does indicate that the informant was properly treated and on account of a misunderstanding, a dispute had cropped up with respect to the balance payment of wages, which has now been redressed in view of the settlement, so arrived at.

On consideration of the compromise which has been effected, continuation of the criminal proceedings against the petitioners, would be an abuse of the process of Court and in such circumstances, therefore, the entire criminal proceedings in connection with AHTU P.S. Case No.1/2026 is, hereby, quashed and set aside.

This writ application stands allowed.

Since as per the terms of the settlement, the balance amount as agreed upon to the tune of Rs.5,00,000/- (Rupees Five Lakhs) is to be handed over to the informant on quashment of the entire criminal proceedings, Mr. Singh, learned senior counsel for the petitioners, in the presence of the Court, has handed over a demand draft bearing No. 004132, drawn in favour of the informant, for an amount of Rs.5,00,000/- (Rupees Five Lakhs Only), which has been accepted by Mr. Abhijeet

Kumar, learned counsel for the informant, who has handed over the said demand draft to the informant, who is physically present in Court.

Pending interlocutory application(s), if any, stands closed.

(Rongon Mukhopadhyay, J.)

(Ram Sharma, J.)

*Dated 04.11.*2026
Shahid/
Uploaded on 06.11.2026