
Savita @ Budul Vs Rammu Chaudhary And Ors

ACQA No. 196 Of 2017

Court: Chhattisgarh High Court

Date of Decision: July 23, 2018

Acts Referred:

Indian Penal Code, 1860 " Section 34, 376, 506

Hon'ble Judges: Ajay Kumar Tripathi, CJ; Prashant Kumar Mishra, J

Bench: Division Bench

Advocate: Arvind Sinha, H. P. Agrawal, A. S. Kachhawaha

Final Decision: Dismissed

Judgement

Prashant Kumar Mishra, J

1. The matter is posted today for information about the death of respondent No.1. The application (IA No.1/2018) is supported with an affidavit of

respondent No.2 Gomati Bai as also the death certificate issued by the Competent Authority certifying that the respondent No.1 Rammu Chaudhary,

S/o Bhullu has died on 20.04.2018.

2. In view of the above, the present acquittal appeal, as against the respondent No.1 Rammu Chaudhary, has abated and as such, the appeal against

him is dismissed as abated.

3. With the consent of the learned counsel for the parties, the appeal is heard finally.

4. On allegation that the deceased accused Rammu Chaudhary sexually exploited the appellant and stayed with her without performing lawful

marriage, a report was lodged by the appellant against the said Rammu Chaudhary and his wife respondent No.2 Gomati Bai. Since Rammu

Chaudhary has died and the acquittal appeal against him has already been dismissed as abated, we are only required to consider as to whether the

respondent No.2's acquittal of the charge under Section 506 of IPC is legal and appropriate.

5. The thrust of allegation in the entire charge sheet was against the respondent No.1 Rammu Chaudhary regarding commission of forcible sexual

intercourse and criminally intimidating the appellant, which was not established in the trial Court. As against the respondent No.2, the only allegation

was that she too shared common intention with the deceased respondent No.1 Rammu Chaudhary in criminally intimidating the appellant and she

helped the respondent No.1 in committing the offence of forcible sexual intercourse with the appellant.

6. There is no charge against the respondent No.2 with the aid of Section 34 of IPC that she assisted her husband Rammu Chaudhary in committing

the offence under Section 376 of IPC. The only charge against her is of criminally intimidating the appellant. However, since the main charge itself

has been found unestablished by the prosecution with which we are fully satisfied and further for the reason that there is no material on record to

conclude that the respondent No.2 was, in any manner, involved in criminally intimidating the appellant, the trial Court has rightly acquitted her of the

charge under Section 506 of IPC.

7. Resultantly, the present acquittal appeal against the respondent No.2 deserves to be and is hereby dismissed.