

## Dinoo Ram Kanwat Vs State Of Chhattisgarh

**Court:** Chhattisgarh High Court

**Date of Decision:** Aug. 13, 2019

**Acts Referred:** Indian Penal Code, 1860 â€” Section 376, 450, 506

Evidence Act, 1872 â€” Section 114A

Code Of Criminal Procedure, 1973 â€” Section 161

**Hon'ble Judges:** Sharad Kumar Gupta, J

**Bench:** Single Bench

**Advocate:** V.G. Tamaskar, H.S. Ahluwalia

**Final Decision:** Dismissed

### Judgement

Offence u/S.,RI for,Fine Rs.,"RI in default of payment

of fine

450, IPC",2 years,200/-,SI for 3 months

506, IPC",6 months,-,-

376, IPC",7 Years,200/-,SI for 3 months

L.J. 2139 wherein it was observed that considering facts and circumstances of the case, and having regard to fact that prosecutrix lived for sometime",,,

with accused in rented house, she was a consenting party.",,,

15. Counsel for the appellant placed reliance in the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court passed in the matter of Mohammad Ali @ Guddu vs. State of,,,

U.P., 2015 Cri. L.J. 1967 wherein no explanation was offered for lodging the FIR delayed by 11 days, testimony of the prosecutrix that she was taken",,,

from one place to other place and remained at various houses for almost two months, she gave explanation that she was threatened, medical evidence",,,

showing that there are no injuries on private parts, it was observed that testimony of prosecutrix does not inspire confidence.",,,

16. Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of Munna -v- Sate of M.P. [(2014) 10 SCC 254 ] observed in para 11 which is relevant and quoted below :-,,,

11. Thus, while absence of injuries or absence of raising alarm or delay in FIR may not by itself be enough to disbelieve the version of prosecutrix in",,,

view of the statutory presumption under Section 114-A of the Evidence Act but if such statement has inherent infirmities, creating doubt about its",,,

veracity, the same may not be acted upon. We are conscious of the sensitivity with which heinous offence under Section 376 IPC has to be treated",,,

but in the present case the circumstances taken as a whole create doubt about the correctness of the prosecution version. We are, thus, of the opinion",,,

that a case is made out for giving benefit of doubt to the accused. """,,,

17. Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of Radhu Vs. State of M.P. [(2007)12, SCC 57], laid down following judicial precedent :-",,,

A finding of guilt in a case of rape, can be based on the uncorroborated evidence of the prosecutrix and her testimony should not be rejected on the",,,

basis of minor discrepancies and contradictions. Absence of injuries on the private parts of the victim will not by itself falsified the case of rape, nor",,,

can be construed as evidence of consent nor the opinion of a doctor that there was no evidence of any sexual intercourse or rape,sufficient to",,,

disbelieve the victim. However courts should , at the same time, bear in mind that false charges of rape are not uncommon, and there are some rare",,,

instances where a parent has persuaded a gullible or obedient daughter to make a false charge of a rape either to take revenge or extort money or to,,,

get rid of financial liability. Whether there was rape or not would depend ultimately on the facts and circumstances of each case. """,,,

18. Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of Raju and others -v- State of MP [(2009) 3 SCC(Cri) 751)], held that testimony of the prosecutrix is",,,

believable on a par with that of an injured witness, her testimony cannot always be presumed to be gospel truth. Possibility of exaggeration or",,,

embellishment or false implication where several persons are accused cannot be ruled out. Possibility of immoral past of prosecutrix based on,,,

evidence can be considered.,,,

19. In the matter of Mohd. Ali -v- State of UP [2015 (7) SCC 272], Hon'ble Supreme Court observed in para 30 as under :-",,,

30. True it is, the grammar of law permits that the testimony of a prosecutrix can be accepted without any corroboration without material particulars, ",,,

for she has to be placed on a higher pedestal than an injured witness, but, a pregnant one, when a court, on studied scrutiny of the evidence finds it",,,

difficult to accept the version of the prosecutrix, because it is not unreproachable, there is requirement for search of such direct or circumstantial",,,

evidence which would lend assurance to her testimony. """,,,

20. PW-1 prosecutrix says in para No. 5 during her cross- examination that she does not know the name of appellant.,,,

21. In the case in hand in alleged FIR Ex. P-1 and alleged statement of prosecutrix recorded under Section 161 Cr.P.C. Ex. D.1, the name of culprit",,,

has mentioned as Deenu Ram.,,,

22. PW-1 prosecutrix says in para No. 5 that appellant is from her village. There is no such evidence on record on strength of which it can be said that,,,

this statement of PW-1 prosecutrix is not believable. Thus this Court believes this statement of PW-1 prosecutrix. Thus in these circumstances this,,,

Court finds that appellant does not get any help from the aforesaid statement of para 5 of PW-1 prosecutrix. Thus this Court is not impressed from the,,,

argument raised by counsel for appellant, regarding this aspect." ,,,

23. P.W.-1 prosecutrix says in para No. 5, P.W.2 Shankar, who is father of prosecutrix says in para No. 4 that the houses of Anand and Madan are" ,,,

beside their house. Near their house, houses of Raju, Panchhu and Baratu are situated. D.W.1 Sukhram says in para No. 2 that if someone will shout" ,,,

from the house of P.W.2 Shankar, it would be heard in his house. Near the spot way is for the pond, people come and go through that way since" ,,,

morning to till 10 p.m. D.W.3 Hemant Das says in para No. 1 of his statement given on oath that near the house of prosecutrix houses of Sukhram,,,

and Anand are situated. Near the spot way is for pond, people frequently come and go from that way. These circumstances are not sufficient to say" ,,,

that aforesaid statements of para No.1 of prosecutrix, para No. 2 of P.W.2 Shankar, para No.1 of P.W.3 Smt. Bitan Bai are improbable. Thus this" ,,,

Court disallowed the argument of the counsel of appellant in this regard.,,,

24. P.W.1 prosecutrix says in para No. 7 that she had scratched the body of the appellant by her nails. As per the prosecution story at the time of,,,

examination of appellant by doctor no injury was found on the body of the appellant. These circumstances are not sufficient to say that prosecutrix,,,

was allegedly 'consenting party' thus this Court reject the argument of counsel of appellant in the reference.,,,

25. There are the omissions in Ex. P.1 and Ex. D.1 that allegedly appellant had thrown her on the earth, she was eating meals. There is the" ,,,

contradiction in Ex. P.1, Ex. D.1 and between the statement of P.W.1 prosecutrix that allegedly appellant had laid down her on the cot. These" ,,,

omissions and contradictions are not important and do not affect the testimony of para 2 of P.W. 1 prosecutrix. Thus this Court disallows the argument,,,

put-forth by counsel for the appellant in this regard.,,,

26. P.W.4 Dr. Renuka Prasanna says in para No. 5 during her cross- examination that she had not found any lacerated wound on the hymen of,,,

prosecutrix. But looking to the aforesaid judicial precedent laid down by Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of Radhu (supra), this Court finds that" ,,,

the absence of injuries on the private parts of prosecutrix will not falsify the case of rape. Thus this Court disallows the argument put- forth by counsel,,,

for the appellant in the reference.,,,

27. P.W. 4 Dr. Renuka Prasanna says in para No. 4 that it did not appear that aforesaid scratches of thighs of prosecutrix are caused by other object.,,,

She was not agreed that aforesaid injuries were self inflicted. She further says in para No. 7 that she was not agreed that when during the menstrual,,,

cycle any woman to satisfy her nymphomaniac desire penetrates some article, then aforesaid injuries may be caused.".,,,

28. Ex.P.1 has been lodged on very day at about 19.00 hours. Ex. P.1 reveals that appellant had entered in the house of prosecutrix, closed doors, he".,,,

pressed her mouth, removed her clothes and committed sexual intercourse with her, threatened her to kill.".,,,

29. In the matter of State of H.P. -v- Shree Kant Shekari [2004(8) SCC 153], Hon'ble Supreme Court has held in para 18 as under :-".,,,

18. The unusual circumstances satisfactorily explained the delay in lodging of the first information report. In any event, delay per se is not a mitigating",,,

circumstance for the accused when accusations of rape are involved. Delay in lodging the first information report cannot be used as a ritualistic,,,

formula for discarding the prosecution case and doubting its authenticity. It only puts the court on guard to search for and consider if any explanation,,,

has been offered for the delay. Once it is offered, the court is to only see whether it is satisfactory or not. In case if the prosecution fails to",,,

satisfactorily explain the delay and there is possibility of embellishment or exaggeration in the prosecution version on account of such delay, it is a",,,

relevant factor. On the other hand, satisfactory explanation of the delay is weighty enough to reject the plea of false implication or vulnerability of the",,,

prosecution case. As the factual scenario shows, the victim was totally unaware of the catastrophe which had befallen her. That being so, the mere",,,

delay in lodging of the first information report does not in any way render the prosecution version brittle. These aspects were highlighted in Tulshidas,,,

Kanolkar v. State of Goa [(2003) 8 SCC 590 : 2004 SCC (Cri) 44] .""",,,

30. The relevant portion of para-13 of Puran Chand -v- State of H.P. [(2014) 5 SCC 689] wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court has made some,,,

observation is quoted below :-,,,

13. ....The delay in lodging the FIR has been clearly explained by the prosecution relating the circumstance and the witnesses supporting the",,,

same have stood the test of scrutiny of the cross-examination as a result of which the version of the victim girl cannot be doubted. The delay in,,,

lodging the FIR thus stands fully explained.""",,,

31. In Ex.P.1 it has been mentioned that when her parents returned back then she went to lodge the report. P.W.1 prosecutrix says in para No. 1 that,,,

her parents had returned back in the evening. P.W.2 Shagnar says in para No. 2 that he and his wife returned back in the evening. P.W.3 Bitan Bai,,,

says in para No. 1 of her statement given on oath that they had returned back in the evening. There is no such evidence on record on strength of,,,

which it can be said that such explanation is not simple, not natural, not normal. Moreover, in the Indian society it is very natural conduct that normally",,,

a report of alleged rape is lodged after consultation with the head of the family because honour and reputation of the family are involved in such a,,,

matter. If head of the family is not present then other family members wait for him. In these circumstances this Court finds that delay of few hours in,,,

lodging Ex.P.1 is satisfactorily explained and convincing. Thus looking to the aforesaid judicial precedents laid down by Hon'ble Supreme Court in the,,,

matter of Shree Kant Shekari (supra), Puran Chand (supra) and Munna (supra) this Court finds that delay of few hours in lodging Ex. P.1 is not fatal",,,

to the prosecution case.,,,

32. There is no such material available on record on strength of which it can be said Ex. P.1 is fabricated or concocted to falsely implicate the,,,

appellant in alleged offences.,,,

33. P.W.1 prosecutrix says in para No. 10 that there is no cordial relation between appellant and her father.,,,

34. In the matter of State of H.P. -v- Shree Kant Shekari (supra) the Hon'ble Supreme Court has dealt with the false implication, the relevant portion",,,

of para 22 reads as under :-,,,

22. .... In any event no girl of a tender age and her parents would like to jeopardise her entire future by falsely implicating a person alleging",,,

forcible sexual intercourse".",,,

35. In the matter of Balwant Singh Vs State of Punjab [(1987) 2 SCC 27] Hon'ble Supreme Court has laid down the following judicial precedent-,,,

Defence case that the father of prosecutrix falsely implicated the accused persons on the ground of litigation and enmity cannot be accepted as it is",,,

absurd that on account of litigation father of prosecutrix would falsely involve his daughter in case of rape by the appellant".",,,

36. There is no such material available on record on strength of which it can be said that there was no cordial relation between father of the,,,

prosecutrix and appellant, thus without happening any incident, P.W.1 prosecutrix had made aforesaid statement of para No. 2. In these",,,

circumstances and looking to the aforesaid judicial precedents laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of Shree Kant Shekari (supra),,,

and Balwant Singh (supra) this Court finds that it is absurd that on account of non-cordial relation prosecutrix and his family would stake their,,,

reputation and honour and falsely implicate the appellant.,,,

37. There is no such evidence on record on strength of which it can be said that aforesaid statements of para No. 2 of prosecutrix, P.W.2 Shankar",,,

para No. 1 of P.W.3 Smt. Bitan Bai, are not simple, not natural and not normal.",,,

38. In the case in hand FIR was not lodged with inordinate delay. Nobody had seen prosecutrix and appellant in compromising position. It has been,,,

earlier decided that prosecutrix was not consenting party. In the case in hand it is not the situation that she was taken from so many places and kept in,,,

various houses for considerable period. Thus appellant does not get any help from the aforesaid judicial precedent laid down by the co-ordinate Bench,,,

of this Court in the matter of Natwar Dewangan (supra), aforesaid judicial precedents laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of" ,,,

Lekhram (supra) and Mohammad Ali @ Guddu (supra).,,,

39. Thus, on the basis of aforesaid judicial precedents laid down by Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matters of Radhu (supra), Mohd. Ali (supra), Raju" ,,,

and others (supra) and Munna (supra), this Court finds that this Court can act upon aforesaid sole testimony of para 2 of P.W. 1 Prosecutrix." ,,,

40. In the case in hand, the aforesaid statement of para 2 of P.W.1 prosecutrix gets corroboration from the aforesaid statements of para 2 of P.W.-2" ,,,

Shankar, para 1 of P.W.3 Bitan Bai, Ex. P.1, Ex. P.4." ,,,

41. After the appreciation of the evidence discussed herebefore, this Court believes on para 2 of P.W. 1 prosecutrix, P.W. 2 Shankar, para 1 & 2 of" ,,,

P.W.3 Bitan Bai and disbelieves aforesaid statements of para 2 of D.W. 1 Sukhram, para 1 of D.W.2 Bhuwan Lal Patel, D.W.3 Hemant Das and" ,,,

D.W.4 Bhagbali in the reference that appellant had not committed any offence.,,,

42. After the appreciation of the evidence discussed herebefore this Court finds that prosecution has succeeded to prove beyond reasonable doubt that,,,

appellant had committed house trespass in order to commit rape with prosecutrix which is punishable with imprisonment for life, and committed rape" ,,,

with her and threatened her to kill which are punishable under Section 450, 376, 506 of the IPC respectively. Thus, this Court affirms the judgment of" ,,,

conviction passed by the trial Court.,,,

43. As regards sentences awarded to the appellant for offence punishable under Sections 450, 376 and 506 of the IPC, considering the facts and" ,,,

circumstances of the case, they appear to be just and proper, and do not call for any interference. Hence, this Court also affirms the sentences" ,,,

regarding Sections 450, 376 and 506 of IPC awarded by the trial Court." ,,,

44. The appeal being devoid of merit deserves to be and is hereby dismissed.,,,

45. The appellant is reported to be on bail. His bail and bonds are cancelled. He is directed to surrender immediately before the trial Court for,,,

undergoing the remaining part of jail sentences, if any. The trial Court is also directed to take the appellant in custody immediately for undergoing the" ,,,

remaining part of jail sentences, if any." ,,,