

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JAMMU & KASHMIR AND LADAKH
AT SRINAGAR

CRM(M) No. 393/2021 CrIM No. 1334/2021

Mohammad Akram Rather and Ors.

...Petitioner(s)

Through: Mr. Shah Ashiq Hussain, Advocate with
Ms. Palvi Ghonkrokta, Advocate.

Vs.

UT through Director General of Police and Ors.

...Respondent(s)

Through: Mr. Mubeen Wani, Dy.AG with
Ms. Nowbahar Khan, Assisting Counsel.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR JUSTICE JAVED IQBAL WANI, JUDGE

ORDER

15.07.2024

(ORAL)

1. The petitioners herein have invoked the inherent power of this Court enshrined under Section 482 CrPC for quashment of FIR No. 60/2021 registered with Police Station Devsar under Sections 341, 354 323 and 506 IPC.
2. Facts giving rise to the filing of the instant petitions as stated in the petition are that the petitioner 1 is the owner in possession of land inherited from the ancestors along with part of land purchased in respect whereof a mutation stands attested on 30.09.1968 and that in presence of mother-in-law of the respondent 4 herein being step sister of the petitioner 1 herein who have had taken her share in the inherited property along with the petitioner 1 resulted into attestation of a demarcation mutation in this regard on 09.04.2003 and that greed prevailed upon the respondent 4 herein and started claiming a share in the property of the petitioner 1 and in the process started harassing the petitioner 1 and that though an amicable settlement was undertaken through the intervention of some respectable persons of the area, however, due to adamant approach of the respondent 4 herein the said settlement did not materialize whereafter private respondents challenged the aforesaid mutations before the Additional Deputy Commissioner Kulgam wherein an interim order of status-quo came to be passed against the petitioner 1 herein and that the petitioner

herein filed response/objections to the said case filed by respondent 4 herein whereafter the said order of status-quo passed by the Additional District Commissioner, Kulgam came to be modified permitting the petitioners herein to raise construction thereon the land in question and that **on 10.09.2021 the respondent 4 herein along with her husband and other relatives trespassed into the property of the petitioner 1 and started damaging the plinth raised by the petitioner 1 and in the process thrashed** the petitioner 1 with iron rod whereafter the petitioner was moved to hospital for necessary treatment and thereafter the petitioner rushed to the Police Station for complaint however, surprisingly petitioner 1 was locked up there at the instance of the respondent 4 herein and that after persuasion an FIR came to be registered by the Police Station Devsar against respondent 4 and other accused persons and that respondent 4 herein being highly influential person used police administrations influence and put a false and fabricated story and got FIR No. 60/2021 registered with Police Station Devsar Kulgam against the petitioner under Sections 341, 354, 323 and 506 IPC in which the FIR petitioner 1 came to be granted bail by the Sessions Judge Kulgam on 14.09.2021.

3. The petitioners have challenged the FIR no. 60/2021 supra in the instant petition on multiple grounds urged in the petition.
4. Respondent 4 herein though has entered appearance in response to the notice issued in the instant petition, yet, has not filed any reply, however, the official respondents have filed response to the petition wherein it is being stated that an application came to be received from one Ruby Jan W/o Sabzar Ahmad Bhat R/o Sopar Tehsil Desar Kulgam on 12.09.2021 against the petitioners to the effect that the accused no. 1 petitioner 1 herein is the brother of her mother in law whose share in the property has not been given to her mother in law and on insistence of seeking a share in the property the accused persons forcibly entered into her residential house and thrashed her mother-in-law besides outraging her modesty whereupon FIR No. 60/2021 came to be registered and investigation set into motion and upon investigation it came to be established that the accused 1 and 2

petitioners 1 and 2 herein have committed the offences under Sections 341, 354, 323 and 506 IPC and accused petitioners 3 and 4 herein were found to have committed offences under Sections 341, 323 and 506 IPC.

Heard counsel for the parties and perused the record.

5. Before proceeding to advert to the grounds urged by the petitioners in the instant petition while seeking quashment of impugned FIR, it would be appropriate to refer the ambit and scope of the inherent power enshrined under Section 482 CrPC. A reference in this regard to the judgement of the Apex Court passed in case titled as **“Neeharika Infrastructure Private Limited Vs. State of Maharashtra and Ors”**., reported in **AIR 2021 SC 1918** would be relevant wherein at para 7 following has been laid down: -

“7. While considering the aforesaid issue, law on the exercise of powers by the High Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C. and/or under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to quash the FIR/complaint and the parameters for exercise of such powers and scope and ambit of the power by the High Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C. and/or under Article 226 of the Constitution of India are required to be referred to as the very parameters which are required to be applied while quashing the FIR will also be applicable while granting interim stay/protection.

7.1 The first case on the point which is required to be noticed is the decision of this Court in the case of R.P. Kapur (supra). While dealing with the inherent powers of the High Court under Section 561-A of the earlier Code (which is pari materia with Section 482 of the Code), it is observed and held that the inherent powers of the High Court under Section 561 of the earlier Code cannot be exercised in regard to the matters specifically covered by the other provisions of the Code; the inherent jurisdiction of the High Court can be exercised to quash proceedings in a proper case either to prevent the abuse of the process of any court or otherwise to secure the ends of justice; ordinarily criminal proceedings instituted against an accused person must be tried under the provisions of the Code, and the High Court would be reluctant to interfere with the said proceedings at an interlocutory stage. After observing this, thereafter this Court then carved out some exceptions to the above-stated rule, which are as under:

“(i) Where it manifestly appears that there is a legal bar against the institution or continuance of the criminal proceeding in respect of the offence alleged. Absence of the requisite sanction may, for instance, furnish cases under this category.

(ii) Where the allegations in the first information report or the complaint, even if they are taken at their face value and accepted in their entirety, do not constitute the offence alleged; in such cases no question of appreciating evidence arises; it is a matter merely of looking at the

complaint or the first information report to decide whether the offence alleged is disclosed or not.

- (iii) Where the allegations made against the accused person do constitute an offence alleged but there is either no legal evidence adduced in support of the case or the evidence adduced clearly or manifestly fails to prove the charge. In dealing with this class of cases it is important to bear in mind the distinction between a case where there is no legal evidence or where there is evidence which is manifestly and clearly inconsistent with the accusation made and cases where there is legal evidence which on its appreciation may or may not support the accusation in question.

In exercising its jurisdiction under Section 561- A the High Court would not embark upon an enquiry as to whether the evidence in question is reliable or not. That is the function of the trial Magistrate, and ordinarily it would not be open to any party to invoke the High Court's inherent jurisdiction and contend that on a reasonable appreciation of the evidence the accusation made against the accused would not be sustained."

7.2. In the case of Kurukshetra University (supra), this Court observed and held that inherent powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C. do not confer an arbitrary jurisdiction on the High Court to act according to whim or caprice; that statutory power has to be exercised sparingly with circumspection and in the rarest of rare cases. In the case before this Court, the High Court quashed the first information report filed by the Kurukshetra University through Warden and that too without issuing notice to the University, in exercise of inherent powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C. This Court noticed and observed that the High Court was not justified in quashing the FIR when the police had not even commenced investigation into the complaint filed by the Warden of the University and no proceedings were at all pending before any Court in pursuance of the FIR.

7.3 Then comes the celebrated decision of this Court in the case of Bhajan Lal (supra). In the said decision, this Court considered in detail the scope of the High Court powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C. and/or Article 226 of the Constitution of India to quash the FIR and referred to several judicial precedents and held that the High Court should not embark upon an inquiry into the merits and demerits of the allegations and quash the proceedings without allowing the investigating agency to complete its task. At the same time, this Court identified the following cases in which FIR/complaint can be quashed:

"102.(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."

7.4 In the case of *Golconda Lingaswamy (supra)*, after considering the decisions of this Court in the cases of *R.P. Kapur (supra)* and *Bhajan Lal (supra)* and other decisions on the exercise of inherent powers by the High Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C., in paragraphs 5, 7 and 8, it is observed and held as under:

"5. Exercise of power under Section 482 of the Code in a case of this nature is the exception and not the rule. The section does not confer any new powers on the High Court. It only saves the inherent power which the Court possessed before the enactment of the Code. It envisages three circumstances under which the inherent jurisdiction may be exercised, namely: (i) to give effect to an order under the Code, (ii) to prevent abuse of the process of court, and (iii) to otherwise secure the ends of justice. It is neither possible nor desirable to lay down any inflexible rule which would govern the exercise of inherent jurisdiction.

No legislative enactment dealing with procedure can provide for all cases that may possibly arise. Courts, therefore, have inherent powers apart from express provisions of law which are necessary for proper discharge of functions and duties imposed upon them by law. That is the doctrine which finds expression in the section which merely recognises and preserves inherent powers of the High Courts.

All courts, whether civil or criminal, possess in the absence of any express provision, as inherent in their constitution, all such powers as are necessary to do the right and to undo a wrong in course of

administration of justice on the principle *quando lex aliquid alicui concedit, conceditur et id sine quo res ipsa esse non potest* (when the law gives a person anything, it gives him that without which it cannot exist). While exercising powers under the section, the Court does not function as a court of appeal or revision. Inherent jurisdiction under the section though wide has to be exercised sparingly, carefully and with caution and only when such exercise is justified by the tests specifically laid down in the section itself.

It is to be exercised *ex debito justitiae* to do real and substantial justice for the administration of which alone courts exist. Authority of the court exists for advancement of justice and if any attempt is made to abuse that authority so as to produce injustice, the court has power to prevent such abuse. It would be an abuse of the process of the court to allow any action which would result in injustice and prevent promotion of justice

In exercise of the powers court would be justified to quash any proceeding if it finds that initiation or continuance of it amounts to abuse of the process of court or quashing of these proceedings would otherwise serve the ends of justice. When no offence is disclosed by the complaint, the court may examine the question of fact. When a complaint is sought to be quashed, it is permissible to look into the materials to assess what the complainant has alleged and whether any offence is made out even if the allegations are accepted in toto.

7. In dealing with the last category, it is important to bear in mind the distinction between a case where there is no legal evidence or where there is evidence which is clearly inconsistent with the accusations made, and a case where there is legal evidence which, on appreciation, may or may not support the accusations. When exercising jurisdiction under Section 482 of the Code, the High Court would not ordinarily embark upon an enquiry whether the evidence in question is reliable or not or whether on a reasonable appreciation of it accusation would not be sustained.

That is the function of the trial Judge. Judicial process, no doubt should not be an instrument of oppression, or, needless harassment. Court should be circumspect and judicious in exercising discretion and should take all relevant facts and circumstances into consideration before issuing process, lest it would be an instrument in the hands of a private complainant to unleash vendetta to harass any person needlessly. At the same time the section is not an instrument handed over to an accused to short-circuit a prosecution and bring about its sudden death.....

8. As noted above, the powers possessed by the High Court under Section 482 of the Code are very wide and the very plenitude of the power requires great caution in its exercise. Court must be careful to see that its decision in exercise of this power is based on sound principles. The inherent power should not be exercised to stifle a legitimate prosecution.

High Court being the highest court of a State should normally refrain from giving a *prima facie* decision in a case where the entire facts are incomplete and hazy, more so when the evidence has not been

collected and produced before the Court and the issues involved, whether factual or legal, are of magnitude and cannot be seen in their true perspective without sufficient material. Of course, no hard-and-fast rule can be laid down in regard to cases in which the High Court will exercise its extraordinary jurisdiction of quashing the proceeding at any stage. [See *Janata Dal v. H.S. Chowdhary* [(1992) 4 SCC 305 : 1993 SCC (Cri) 36 : AIR 1993 SC 892] and *Raghubir Saran (Dr.) v. State of Bihar* [AIR 1964 SC 1 : (1964) 1 Cri LJ 1].] It would not be proper for the High Court to analyse the case of the complainant in the light of all probabilities in order to determine whether a conviction would be sustainable and on such premises, arrive at a conclusion that the proceedings are to be quashed.

It would be erroneous to assess the material before it and conclude that the complaint cannot be proceeded with. In a proceeding instituted on complaint, exercise of the inherent powers to quash the proceedings is called for only in a case where the complaint does not disclose any offence or is frivolous, vexatious or oppressive. If the allegations set out in the complaint do not constitute the offence of which cognisance has been taken by the Magistrate, it is open to the High Court to quash the same in exercise of the inherent powers under Section 482 of the Code. It is not, however, necessary that there should be meticulous analysis of the case before the trial to find out whether the case would end in conviction or acquittal.

The complaint/FIR has to be read as a whole. If it appears that on consideration of the allegations in the light of the statement made on oath of the complainant or disclosed in the FIR that the ingredients of the offence or offences are disclosed and there is no material to show that the complaint/FIR is mala fide, frivolous or vexatious, in that event there would be no justification for interference by the High Court. When an information is lodged at the police station and an offence is registered, then the mala fides of the informant would be of secondary importance. It is the material collected during the investigation and evidence led in court which decides the fate of the accused person. The allegations of mala fides against the informant are of no consequence and cannot by themselves be the basis for quashing the proceeding."

7.5. In the case of *Zandu Pharmaceutical Works Ltd. (supra)*, in paragraph 11, this Court has observed and held as under:

"11.....the powers possessed by the High Court under Section 482 of the Code are very wide and the very plenitude of the power requires great caution in its exercise. Court must be careful to see that its decision in exercise of this power is based on sound principles. The inherent power should not be exercised to stifle a legitimate prosecution. The High Court being the highest court of a State should normally refrain from giving a prima facie decision in a case where the entire facts are incomplete and hazy, more so when the evidence has not been collected and produced before the court and the issues involved, whether factual or legal, are of magnitude and cannot be seen in their true perspective without sufficient material. of course, no hard-and-fast rule can be laid down in regard to cases in which the High Court will exercise its extraordinary jurisdiction of quashing the proceeding at any stage.

It would not be proper for the High Court to analyse the case of the complainant in the light of all probabilities in order to determine whether a conviction would be sustainable and on such premise arrive at a conclusion that the proceedings are to be quashed. It would be erroneous to assess the material before it and conclude that the complaint cannot be proceeded with. In a proceeding instituted on complaint, exercise of the inherent powers to quash the proceedings is called for only in a case where the complaint does not disclose any offence or is frivolous, vexatious or oppressive. If the allegations set out in the complaint do not constitute the offence of which cognizance has been taken by the Magistrate, it is open to the High Court to quash the same in exercise of the inherent powers under Section 482 of the Code.

It is not, however, necessary that there should be meticulous analysis of the case before the trial to find out whether the case would end in conviction or acquittal. The complaint has to be read as a whole. If it appears that on consideration of the allegations in the light of the statement made on oath of the complainant that the ingredients of the offence or offences are disclosed and there is no material to show that the complaint is mala fide, frivolous or vexatious, in that event there would be no justification for interference by the High Court. When an information is lodged at the police station and an offence is registered, then the mala fides of the informant would be of secondary importance. It is the material collected during the investigation and evidence led in court which decides the fate of the accused person. The allegations of mala fides against the informant are of no consequence and cannot by themselves be the basis for quashing the proceedings."

7.6. *In the case of Sanapareddy Maheedhar Seshagiri (supra), in paragraph 31, it is observed and held as under:*

"31. A careful reading of the abovenoted judgments makes it clear that the High Court should be extremely cautious and slow to interfere with the investigation and/or trial of criminal cases and should not stall the investigation and/or prosecution except when it is convinced beyond any manner of doubt that FIR does not disclose commission of any offence or that the allegations contained in FIR do not constitute any cognizable offence or that the prosecution is barred by law or the High Court is convinced that it is necessary to interfere to prevent abuse of the process of the Court.

In dealing with such cases, the High Court has to bear in mind that judicial intervention at the threshold of the legal process initiated against a person accused of committing offence is highly detrimental to the larger public and societal interest. The people and the society have a legitimate expectation that those committing offences either against an individual or the society are expeditiously brought to trial and, if found guilty, adequately punished. Therefore, while deciding a petition filed for quashing FIR or complaint or restraining the competent authority from investigating the allegations contained in FIR or complaint or for stalling the trial of the case, the High Court should be extremely careful and circumspect.

If the allegations contained in FIR or complaint disclose commission of some crime, then the High Court must keep its hands off and allow the investigating agency to complete the investigation without any fetter and also refrain from passing order which may impede the trial. The High Court should not go into the merits and demerits of the allegations simply because the petitioner alleges malus animus against the author of FIR or the complainant. The High Court must also refrain from making imaginary journey in the realm of possible harassment which may be caused to the petitioner on account of investigation of FIR or complaint. Such a course will result in miscarriage of justice and would encourage those accused of committing crimes to repeat the same. However, if the High Court is satisfied that the complaint does not disclose commission of any offence or prosecution is barred by limitation or that the proceedings of criminal case would result in failure of justice, then it may exercise inherent power under Section 482 CrPC."

7.7. *In the case of Arun Gulab Gawali (supra), this Court set aside the order passed by the High Court quashing the criminal complaint/FIR which was even filed by the complainant. In the case before this Court, prayer for quashing the FIR before the High Court was by the complainant himself and the High Court quashed the FIR/complaint in exercise of the powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C. Quashing and setting aside the judgment and order passed by the High Court quashing the FIR, this Court in paragraphs 13 and 27 to 29 has observed as under:*

"13. The power of quashing criminal proceedings has to be exercised very sparingly and with circumspection and that too in the rarest of rare cases and the Court cannot be justified in embarking upon an enquiry as to the reliability or genuineness or otherwise of allegations made in the FIR/complaint, unless the allegations are so patently absurd and inherently improbable so that no prudent person can ever reach such a conclusion. The extraordinary and inherent powers of the Court do not confer an arbitrary jurisdiction on the Court to act according to its whims or caprice. However, the Court, under its inherent powers, can neither intervene at an uncalled for stage nor can it "soft-pedal the course of justice" at a crucial stage of investigation/proceedings.

The provisions of Articles 226, 227 of the Constitution of India and Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (hereinafter called as "CrPC") are a device to advance justice and not to frustrate it. The power of judicial review is discretionary, however, it must be exercised to prevent the miscarriage of justice and for correcting some grave errors and to ensure that stream of administration of justice remains clean and pure.

However, there are no limits of power of the Court, but the more the power, the more due care and caution is to be exercised in invoking these powers. (Vide State of W.B. v. Swapan Kumar Guha [(1982) 1 SCC 561 : 1982 SCC (Cri) 283 : AIR 1982 SC 949], Pepsi Foods Ltd. v. Special Judicial Magistrate [(1998) 5 SCC 749 : 1998 SCC (Cri) 1400], G.Sagar Suri v. State of U.P. [(2000) 2 SCC 636 : 2000 SCC (Cri) 513 : AIR 2000 SC 754] and Ajay Mitra v. State of M.P. [(2003) 3 SCC 11 : 2003 SCC (Cri) 703])

xxx xxx xxx

27. *The High Court proceeded on the perception that as the complainant himself was not supporting the complaint, he would not support the case of the prosecution and there would be no chance of conviction, thus the trial itself would be a futile exercise. Quashing of FIR/complaint on such a ground cannot be held to be justified in law. Ordinarily, the Court of Session is empowered to discharge an accused under Section 227 CrPC even before initiating the trial.*

The accused can, therefore, move the trial court itself for such a relief and the trial court would be in a better position to analyse and pass an order as it is possessed of all the powers and the material to do so. It is, therefore, not necessary to invoke the jurisdiction under Section 482 CrPC for the quashing of a prosecution in such a case. The reliance on affidavits by the High Court would be a weak, hazy and unreliable source for adjudication on the fate of a trial. The presumption that an accused would never be convicted on the material available is too risky a proposition to be accepted readily, particularly in heinous offences like extortion.

28. *A claim founded on a denial by the complainant even before the trial commences coupled with an allegation that the police had compelled the lodging of a false FIR, is a matter which requires further investigation as the charge is levelled against the police. If the prosecution is quashed, then neither the trial court nor the investigating agency has any opportunity to go into this question, which may require consideration. The State is the prosecutor and all prosecution is the social and legal responsibility of the State. An offence committed is a crime against society and not against the victim alone. The victim under undue pressure or influence of the accused or under any threat or compulsion may resile back but that would not absolve the State from bringing the accused to book, who has committed an offence and has violated the law of the land.*

29. *Thus, while exercising such power the Court has to act cautiously before proceeding to quash a prosecution in respect of an offence which hits and affects the society at large. It should be a case where no other view is possible nor any investigation or inquiry is further required. There cannot be a general proposition of law, so as to fit in as a straitjacket formula for the exercise of such power. Each case will have to be judged on its own merit and the facts warranting exercise of such power. More so, it was not a case of civil nature where there could be a possibility of compromise or involving an offence which may be compoundable under Section 320 CrPC, where the Court could apply the ratio of *Madhavrao Jiwajirao Scindia [(1988) 1 SCC 692 : 1988 SCC (Cri) 234 : AIR 1988 SC 709]*."*

What emerges from the plain reading of the principles of law laid down by the Apex court in the judgment supra is that the court in exercise of inherent power under Section 482 CrPC has only to consider whether the allegations in the FIR disclose commission of cognizable offences or not and that the court is not required to

consider on merits whether or not the allegations make out a cognizable offence and that the court is to permit the investigating agency to investigate the allegations in FIR.

It is also settled position of law as laid down by the Apex Court that the High court in exercise of power under Section 482 CrPC cannot take detailed examination of the facts contained in FIR by acting as an appellate court and draw its own conclusion and that the expressions “abuse of process of law” or “to secure the ends of justice” being the fundamental principles regulating and governing the exercise of inherent power enshrined under Section 482 CrPC do not confer unlimited jurisdiction upon the High court and that if in a particular case factual foundation for offence has been laid down, interference therein the said case is permissible and that a court has to refuse to interfere or to display indulgence if a prima-facie case is made out disclosing the ingredient of the offences against the accused.

6. Keeping in mind the aforesaid position and principles of law and reverting back to the case in hand, perusal of the record available on the file inasmuch as the CD file produced by investigating officer, it is manifest that prima-facie case has been come to exist and found established disclosing the ingredients of offences alleged to be committed by the accused petitioners herein as such, under these circumstances, the court is not inclined to exercise inherent power enshrined under Section 482 CrPC.
7. Viewed thus, what has been observed, considered and analyzed hereinabove, the petition fails and is accordingly dismissed. Interim direction, if any shall stand vacated. CD file produced for perusal of the court has been returned back in the open court to the counsel for the respondents.

(JAVED IQBAL WANI)
JUDGE

SRINAGAR

15.07.2024

Ishaq

Whether the order is speaking? Yes
Whether approved for reporting ? Yes