

(2010) 09 AHC CK 0424

Allahabad High Court

Case No: None

Imran and Others

APPELLANT

Vs

State of U.P. and Another

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision: Sept. 1, 2010

Acts Referred:

- Criminal Procedure Code, 1973 (CrPC) - Section 125, 227, 228, 239, 245
- Penal Code, 1860 (IPC) - Section 323, 392, 427, 452, 504

Hon'ble Judges: Rajesh Dayal Khare, J

Bench: Single Bench

Final Decision: Disposed Of

Judgement

Rajesh Dayal Khare, J.

Heard learned Counsel for the applicants and learned A.G.A.

2. The present 482 Cr.P.C. petition has been filed for quashing the summoning order dated 05.01.2010 passed by learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Court No. 13, District Jaunpur in Complaint Case No. 6439 of 2009 Farooq v. Imran and Ors., under Sections 323, 504, 506, 452, 427 I.P.C.

3. The contention of the counsel for the applicants is that no offence against the applicants is disclosed and the present prosecution has been instituted with a malafide intention for the purposes of harassment. He pointed out certain documents and statements in support of his contention. It is further contended that the sister of the applicant No. 1 had initiated proceedings against the opposite party No. 2 u/s 125 Cr.P.C., and the applicant No. 1 had also filed a complaint case against the in-laws of his sister under Sections 392, 323, 504, 506 I.P.C., in which they were summoned and as a counter blast to the same, the present proceedings has been launched against by the opposite party No. 2 against the applicants which is not sustainable in law.

4. From the perusal of the material on record and looking into the facts of the case at this stage it cannot be said that no offence is made out against the applicants. All the submission made at the bar relates to the disputed question of fact, which cannot be adjudicated upon by this Court u/s 482 Cr.P.C. At this stage only prima facie case is to be seen in the light of the law laid down by Supreme Court in cases of R.P. Kapur v. State of Punjab AIR 1960 S.C. 866; State of Haryana v. Bhajan Lal 1992 SCC (Cr.) 426; State of Bihar v. P.P. Sharma 1992 SCC (Cr.) 192 and lastly Zandu Pharmaceutical Works Ltd. v. Mohd. Saraful Haq and Anr. 2005 SCC (Cr.) 283. The disputed defence of the accused cannot be considered at this stage. Moreover, the applicants have got right of discharge u/s 239 or 227/228 or 245 Cr.P.C. as the case may be through a proper application for the said purpose and they are free to take all the submissions in the said discharge application before the Trial Court.

5. The prayer for quashing the summoning order is refused.

6. However, it is directed that the applicants shall appear and surrender before the court below within 30 days from today and apply for bail, their prayer for bail shall be considered and decided in view of the settled law laid by this Court in the case of Amrawati and Anr. v. State of U.P. reported in 2004 (57) ALR 290 as well as judgment passed by Hon"ble Apex Court reported in 2009 (3) ADJ 322 (SC) Lal Kamendra Pratap Singh v. State of U.P. For a period of 30 days from today or till the disposal of the application for grant of bail whichever is earlier, no coercive action shall be taken against the applicants. However in case the applicants do not appear before the Court below within the aforesaid period, coercive action shall be taken against them. With the aforesaid directions, this application is finally disposed off.