



HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

CRMP No. 496 of 2026

Deepak Sharma S/o Tilakraj Sharma Aged About 50 Years R/o Shivam Sundaram Colony, Behind Vini Saree Centre, Ward No. 10, District Chhindwara, Madhya Pradesh

... Petitioner

versus

1 - The State of Chhattisgarh Through Mahila Thana District Durg
2 - Ruchi Sharma W/o Deepak Sharma Aged About 44 Years R/o House No. 08/A, Road Number 2, Sector 9, Bhilai, District Durg, Chhattisgarh

... Respondents

Order Sheet

28/02/2026	Heard Mr. Ashwin Panickar, learned counsel for the petitioner as well as Mr. Sourabh Sahu, learned Panel Lawyer, appearing for the State/respondent No.1 It has been submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the marriage between the Petitioner and Respondent No.2 was solemnized on 26.01.2004 at Durg and thereafter Respondent No.2 resided at the matrimonial home at Chhindwara, Madhya Pradesh, and that after nearly 17 years of marriage and birth of two children, Respondent No.2 left the matrimonial

	home on 15.05.2021 and started residing at her parental home at Bhilai. Being aggrieved by the same, the Petitioner filed a divorce petition on 13.01.2022 before the Learned Family Court, Chhindwara, and immediately thereafter Respondent No.2 initiated multiple proceedings including a complaint under the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, a transfer petition before the Hon'ble Supreme Court for transfer of divorce proceedings, and a complaint leading to registration of FIR No. 32/2022 dated 24.04.2022 under Section 498-A IPC against the Petitioner and his family members, clearly demonstrating that the criminal proceedings were instituted as a counter-blast to the divorce petition. He further submitted that upon investigation even the police found no material against the Petitioner's parents and sister and dropped charges against them, which itself reflects exaggeration and falsity in the allegations. He also submitted that though the FIR and charge-sheet contain only vague, omnibus and general
--	--

allegations without specifying any particular date, incident, overt act, or unlawful dowry demand attributable to the Petitioner so as to satisfy the essential ingredients of Section 498-A IPC, but the learned JMFC mechanically framed charge on 16.05.2024 without proper application of mind to the essential ingredients of the offence and the learned Second Additional Sessions Judge, Durg, while dismissing the revision, failed to consider that continuation of criminal proceedings in absence of prima facie material would result in grave miscarriage of justice and therefore, the impugned FIR, order framing charge and revisional order are liable to be quashed in exercise of inherent jurisdiction of this Hon'ble Court as their continuation would amount to abuse of the process of Court and harassment of the Petitioner.

Considering the fact that the dispute arrived at between the parties is matrimonial in nature, we deem it appropriate to make an effort to get the said dispute settled by way of mediation.

In view of the above, petitioner is directed to deposit a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- with the Mediation Centre of this Court within a period of one week from today and the same shall be paid to respondent No.2/ complainant on her appearance before the Mediation Centre.

Parties are directed to appear before the Mediation Centre of this Court on **18.03.2026**.

Learned State counsel is directed to inform the private respondent *i.e.* respondent No. 2 about passing of this order, so that she may appear before the Mediation Centre on the aforesaid date.

List this matter along with report of Mediation Centre before this Court on **02.04.2026**.

It is also made clear that if any final settlement is arrived at between the parties, the aforesaid amount so deposited, shall be adjusted.

Sd/-
(Ravindra Kumar Agrawal)
Judge

Sd/-
(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice