

(2026) 01 JH CK 1972

In the Jharkhand High Court

Case No : Criminal Miscellaneous Petition No. 163 Of 2026

Chandan Sah @ Chandan Kumar Sah

APPELLANT

Vs

State Of Jharkhand

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 29-01-2026

Acts Referred:

Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 — Section 528

Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 — Section 115(2), 117(2), 333, 351(2), 352

Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012 — Section 8, 12

Citation : (2026) 01 JH CK 1972

Hon'ble Judges : Anil Kumar Choudhary, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Kaushal Kishor Mishra, Vandana Bharti, Randhir Kumar, Pinki Kumari

Final Decision : Allowed

Judgement

Anil Kumar Choudhary, J

1. Heard the parties.

2. This Criminal Miscellaneous Petition has been filed invoking the jurisdiction of this Court under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 with the prayer to quash the entire criminal proceedings initiated against the petitioners in connection with Narayanpur P.S. Case No.76 of 2025 corresponding to Special POCSO case no. 45 of 2025 and also for quashing the order dated 26.08.2025 passed in connection with the same case by the Special Judge, POCSO Act, Jamtara whereby and whereunder the learned Special Judge, POCSO Act, Jamtara has taken cognizance for the offences punishable under sections 115(2), 117(2), 333, 351(2), 352 of BNS, 2023 and sections 8 and 12 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act and the said case is now pending in the court of learned Special Judge, POCSO Act, Jamtara.

3. Consequent upon the charge sheet having been submitted by the police alleging commission of only the said offences the learned Judge has taken

cognizance of the said offences.

4. It is jointly submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioners and informant/opposite party no. 2 drawing attention of the court to I.A. No. 1435 of 2026 which is supported by the separate affidavits of the pairvikar of all the petitioners as well as the informant/opposite party No.2 of this case that therein it has categorically been mentioned that the parties have already settled their dispute and the informant does not want to proceed with the trial of the case and that the informant has no more grievances against the petitioners. It is further submitted that the due to old enmity between the informant and the petitioners, the entire family members of the petitioners have been implicated in this case. It is submitted that the petitioner no. 5 is a student of MBBS and studying in RIIMS, Ranchi and on the date of alleged occurrence he was present in his hostel at RIIMS, Ranchi whereas the alleged occurrence took place within the local limits of the jurisdiction of the Narayanpur Police Station, Jamtara. It is also submitted that the informant is the Aunt of petitioner no. 5. It is jointly submitted by the learned counsels for the parties that the dispute between the parties is purely a civil dispute and no public policy is involved in this case. Learned counsel for the petitioners next submits that in view of the compromise between the parties, the continuation of this criminal proceeding will amount to abuse of process of law; as in view of the compromise, the chance of conviction of the petitioners is remote and bleak. Hence, it is submitted that the entire criminal proceedings initiated against the petitioners in connection with Narayanpur P.S. Case No.76 of 2025 corresponding to Special POCSO case no. 45 of 2025 which is now pending in the court of learned Special Judge, POCSO Act, Jamtara, be quashed and set aside.

5. Learned Addl. P.P. appearing for the State submits that in view of the compromise between the parties, the State has no objection for quashing and setting aside the entire criminal proceedings initiated against the petitioners in connection with Narayanpur P.S. Case No.76 of 2025 corresponding to Special POCSO case no. 45 of 2025 which is now pending in the court of learned Special Judge, POCSO Act, Jamtara.

6. Having heard the rival submissions made at the Bar and after carefully going through the materials available in the record, it is pertinent to mention here that the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of Parbatbhai Aahir @ Parbatbhai Bhimsinhbhai Karmur & Others vs. State of Gujarat & Another reported in (2017) 9 SCC 641, had the occasion to consider the jurisdiction of the High Court under Section 482 of Code of Criminal Procedure inter alia on the basis of compromise between the parties and has held in paragraph No.11 as under:-

"11. Section 482 is prefaced with an overriding provision. The statute saves the inherent power of the High Court, as a superior court, to make such orders as are necessary (i) to prevent an abuse of the process of any court; or (ii) otherwise to secure the ends of justice. In Gian Singh [Gian Singh v. State of Punjab, (2012) 10 SCC 303 : (2012) 4 SCC (Civ) 1188 : (2013) 1 SCC (Cri]

160 : (2012) 2 SCC (L&S) 988] a Bench of three learned Judges of this Court adverted to the body of precedent on the subject and laid down guiding principles which the High Court should consider in determining as to whether to quash an FIR or complaint in the exercise of the inherent jurisdiction. The considerations which must weigh with the High Court are : (SCC pp. 342-43, para 61)

"61. ... the power of the High Court in quashing a criminal proceeding or FIR or complaint in exercise of its inherent jurisdiction is distinct and different from the power given to a criminal court for compounding the offences under Section 320 of the Code. Inherent power is of wide plenitude with no statutory limitation but it has to be exercised in accord with the guideline engrafted in such power viz. : (i) to secure the ends of justice, or (ii) to prevent abuse of the process of any court. In what cases power to quash the criminal proceeding or complaint or FIR may be exercised where the offender and the victim have settled their dispute would depend on the facts and circumstances of each case and no category can be prescribed. However, before exercise of such power, the High Court must have due regard to the nature and gravity of the crime. Heinous and serious offences of mental depravity or offences like murder, rape, dacoity, etc. cannot be fittingly quashed even though the victim or victim's family and the offender have settled the dispute. Such offences are not private in nature and have a serious impact on society. Similarly, any compromise between the victim and the offender in relation to the offences under special statutes like the Prevention of Corruption Act or the offences committed by public servants while working in that capacity, etc.; cannot provide for any basis for quashing criminal proceedings involving such offences. But the criminal cases having overwhelmingly and predominately civil flavour stand on a different footing for the purposes of quashing, particularly the offences arising from commercial, financial, mercantile, civil, partnership or such like transactions or the offences arising out of matrimony relating to dowry, etc. or the family disputes where the wrong is basically private or personal in nature and the parties have resolved their entire dispute. In this category of cases, the High Court may quash the criminal proceedings if in its view, because of the compromise between the offender and the victim, the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak and continuation of the criminal case would put the accused to great oppression and prejudice and extreme injustice would be caused to him by not quashing the criminal case despite full and complete settlement and compromise with the victim. In other words, the High Court must consider whether it would be unfair or contrary to the interest of justice to continue with the criminal proceeding or continuation of the criminal proceeding would tantamount to abuse of process of law despite settlement and compromise between the victim and the wrongdoer and whether to secure the ends of justice, it is appropriate that the criminal case is put to an end and if the answer to the above question(s) is in the affirmative, the High Court shall be well within its jurisdiction to quash the criminal proceeding."(Emphasis supplied)"

7. Perusal of the record reveals that the offences involved in this case are the result of exaggerations of allegations because of the old enmity between the parties and the enmity relates to civil dispute between the parties.

8. Because of the complete settlement between the offender and the victim, the possibility of conviction of the petitioners is remote and bleak and continuation of the criminal case would put the petitioners to great oppression and prejudice and extreme injustice would be caused to them by not quashing the criminal case despite full and complete settlement and compromise with the victim.

9. Hence, this Court is of the considered view that this is a fit case where the entire criminal proceedings initiated against the petitioners including the order dated 26.08.2025 in connection with Narayanpur P.S. Case No.76 of 2025 corresponding to Special POCSO case no. 45 of 2025 which is now pending in the court of learned Special Judge, POCSO Act, Jamtara be quashed and set aside against the petitioners named above.

10. Accordingly, the entire criminal proceedings initiated against the petitioners including the order dated 26.08.2025 in connection with Narayanpur P.S. Case No.76 of 2025 corresponding to Special POCSO case no. 45 of 2025 which is now pending in the court of learned Special Judge, POCSO Act, Jamtara, is quashed and set aside against the petitioners named above.

11. In the result, this Cr.M.P. stands allowed.

12. In view of disposal of the instant Cr.M.P., I.A. No.1435 of 2026 stands disposed of accordingly.

13. Let a copy of this judgment/order be communicated to the learned court below through FAX at the rate of Rs. 100/- per page to be borne by the petitioner.