

Company: Sol Infotech Pvt. Ltd.

Website: www.courtkutchehry.com

Printed For:

Date: 24/08/2025

Mohanan Vs State Of Kerala

Court: High Court Of Kerala

Date of Decision: Jan. 9, 2025

Acts Referred: Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 â€" Section 482 Indian Penal Code, 1860 â€" Section 376AB, 376(2)(f)(n), 376(3)

Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012 â€" Section 3(b), 4, 5(l), 5(m), 5(n), 6

Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 â€" Section 75

Indian Divorce Act, 1869 â€" Section 10A

Hon'ble Judges: G.Girish, J

Bench: Single Bench

Advocate: A.Ranjith Narayanan, A.Simi, S.K.Saju, Seetha S

Final Decision: Disposed Of

Judgement

G.Girish. J

1. The petitioner is the accused in Crime No.845/2019 of the Thrissur Town West Police Station. In the aforesaid case, the Investigating Agency has

filed a final report alleging the commission of offence under Sections 376 \tilde{A} , AB, \tilde{A} , 376(2)(f)(n) \tilde{A} , & \tilde{A} , 376(3) \tilde{A} , of \tilde{A} , the \tilde{A} , Indian \tilde{A} , Penal \tilde{A} ,

Code,Ã, 1860,Ã, and SectionÃ, 4Ã, readÃ, withÃ, SectionÃ, 3Ã, (b)Ã, &Ã, SectionÃ, 6Ã, readÃ, withÃ, SectionÃ, 5 (l)(m)(n)Ã, ofÃ, theÃ,

ProtectionÃ, ofÃ, ChildrenÃ, fromÃ, SexualÃ, OffencesÃ, Act,Ã, 2012, and Section 75 of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children)

Act, 2015.

2. Ã, The allegation against the petitioner, a person aged 69 years whoÃ, retiredÃ, fromÃ, theÃ, UniversityÃ, ofÃ, Calicut as Section Officer, is that

he committed rape and penetrative sexual assault upon his seven year old granddaughterÃ, byÃ, pressingÃ, hisÃ, fingersÃ, uponÃ, herÃ, genitalÃ,

areaÃ, during various occasions from 2017 to 2019.Ã, According to the petitioner, a false case has been foisted against him by his daughter, who is

the mother of the victim child, since he did not give approval for the wanton life being followedÃ, byÃ, her. ItÃ, isÃ, stated that the victim child was

born in the first marriage of the petitionerââ,¬â,,¢s daughter, which was dissolved under Section 10AÃ, ofÃ, theÃ, IndianÃ, DivorceÃ, Act,Ã, 1869,Ã,

onÃ, 21.08.2017. Thereafter,Ã, the Ã, petitionerââ,¬â,¢sÃ, daughterÃ, isÃ, saidÃ, toÃ, haveÃ, marriedÃ, anotherÃ, person,Ã, butÃ, the above

relationship also did not extend for more than one year.Ã, While the proceedingsÃ, wereÃ, pendingÃ, beforeÃ, theÃ, FamilyÃ, Court,Ã, Thrissur,Ã,

for \tilde{A} , the divorce of the second marriage of the petitioner \tilde{A} ϕ \hat{a} , $\neg \hat{a}$, ϕ s daughter, she is said to have fallen in love with another person, who later on

committed suicide. According to the petitioner, his daughter was having behavioural abnormality and she was undergoing psychiatric treatment.Ã, The

present case is said to have been foisted by the petitioner \tilde{A} ¢ \hat{a} , $\neg \hat{a}$, ¢s daughter, since she was \tilde{A} , in \tilde{A} , in imical \tilde{A} , terms \tilde{A} , with \tilde{A} , the \tilde{A} , petitioner \tilde{A} , due \tilde{A} ,

toÃ, theÃ, admonitionÃ, and correctionalÃ, stepsÃ, being Ã, takenÃ, byÃ, himÃ, toÃ, guideÃ, hisÃ, daughterÃ, toÃ, leadÃ, a disciplined life.

- 3. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Public Prosecutor representing the State of Kerala.
- 4. It is submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that atÃ, presentÃ, theÃ, victimÃ, childÃ, andÃ, herÃ, motherÃ, areÃ, underÃ, theÃ,

care \tilde{A} , and protection of the petitioner and his wife, and the victim \tilde{A} ¢ \hat{a} , $\neg\hat{a}$,¢s mother, who is the daughter of the petitioner, has now realised the wrong

committed by herÃ, inÃ, preferringÃ, aÃ, falseÃ, complaintÃ, againstÃ, theÃ, petitioner. ItÃ, isÃ, further submittedÃ, thatÃ, theÃ,

petitionerââ,¬â,¢sÃ, daughterÃ, andÃ, theÃ, victimÃ, childÃ, fervently wantÃ, toÃ, withdrawÃ, theÃ, falseÃ, complaintÃ, raisedÃ, againstÃ, theÃ,

petitioner,Ã, as misguidedÃ, byÃ, someÃ, unscrupulousÃ, persons. Ã, InÃ, supportÃ, ofÃ, theÃ, above argument, the learned counsel for the

petitioner adverted to an affidavit filedÃ, byÃ, theÃ, victimââ,¬â,¢sÃ, motherÃ, onÃ, 13.12.2024Ã, statingÃ, thatÃ, sheÃ, deeply regretted the

institution of this crime against the petitioner as an act of retaliation for trying to interfere with her freedom.Ã, It is further stated in theÃ, affidavit that

the victim \tilde{A} ¢ \hat{a} , $\neg \hat{a}$,¢s mother preferred the complaint under the advice of some of her friends, and that at present, neither she, nor her daughter, wanted to

prosecute the petitioner. Thus, it is argued by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the criminal proceedings initiated againstÃ, theÃ, petitionerÃ,

inÃ, thisÃ, regardÃ, areÃ, toÃ, beÃ, quashed, since it is writ largeÃ, fromÃ, theÃ, aboveÃ, affidavitÃ, filedÃ, byÃ, theÃ, motherÃ, ofÃ, the

victim that a false case has been foisted against the petitioner.

5. Ã, The learned Public Prosecutor, per contra, submitted that the inherentÃ, powersÃ, underÃ, SectionÃ, 482Ã, ofÃ, theÃ, Code of Criminal

Procedure, 1973, cannot be invoked for the termination of the prosecution proceedingsÃ, inÃ, aÃ, caseÃ, likeÃ, this,Ã, whereÃ, thereÃ, isÃ, veryÃ,

seriousÃ, allegation pertaining to the commission of rape and penetrative sexual assault upon a child.

6. TheÃ, childÃ, whoÃ, isÃ, theÃ, victimÃ, ofÃ, theÃ, offenceÃ, inÃ, thisÃ, caseÃ, is presentlyÃ, agedÃ, onlyÃ, 13Ã, years. ItÃ, isÃ, trueÃ,

that \tilde{A} , her \tilde{A} , mother \tilde{A} , has \tilde{A} , filed \tilde{A} , an affidavit to the effect that the criminal prosecution against the petitioner was launched by her as an act of

retaliation, since she did not like the control exercised by the petitioner upon her free life. But,Ã, itÃ, is well-settled that in cases like this, where the

accusation pertains to rape andÃ, POCSOÃ, ActÃ, offences,Ã, theÃ, prosecution cannot be nipped in the bud invoking the powers under Section

482 Cr.P.C. stating the reason that the parentsÃ, orÃ, guardianÃ, ofÃ, theÃ, victimÃ, hadÃ, sortedÃ, outÃ, theÃ, issueÃ, withÃ, the accused. The

accusations levelled against the petitioner are to be tested inÃ, theÃ, proceedingsÃ, beforeÃ, theÃ, designatedÃ, Court. Ã, IfÃ, theÃ, contentions

raisedÃ, byÃ, theÃ, petitionerÃ, aboutÃ, theÃ, fabrication of false case against him has got any basis, the Trial Court could very well consider the

said aspect atÃ, theÃ, appropriateÃ, stagesÃ, includingÃ, theÃ, stageÃ, ofÃ, hearingÃ, onÃ, framing charges.Ã, However, taking into account of

the fact that the petitioner is a senior citizen and that the victim $\tilde{A}\phi\hat{a}$, $\neg\hat{a}$, ϕ s mother herself has stated that there was no basis for the accusations levelled

against the petitioner, I deem it appropriate to permit the petitioner to appear through his counsel before the Trial Court, except for those occasions

where the personal presence of the petitioner is indispensable for the proper conduct of the trial.

In the result, the petition is disposed of as follows:-

(i) TheÃ, TrialÃ, CourtÃ, shallÃ, notÃ, insistÃ, theÃ, personalÃ, presenceÃ, ofÃ, the petitioner, except for those occasions where his personal

appearance is inevitable in connection with any procedure for the proper conduct of the trial.

(ii) Ã, Ã, IfÃ, theÃ, petitionerÃ, prefersÃ, toÃ, fileÃ, anyÃ, petitionÃ, forÃ, hisÃ, discharge,Ã, it shallÃ, beÃ, disposedÃ, ofÃ, onÃ, meritÃ,

after \tilde{A} , taking \tilde{A} , into \tilde{A} , account \tilde{A} , all \tilde{A} , the facts and circumstances of the case including the stand taken by the victim \tilde{A} ¢\$, nother about the

reasons for the registration of this crime.