



HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

CRMP No. 571 of 2026

Dilip Kumar Uike **Versus** State Of Chhattisgarh

Order Sheet

24.02.2026	Heard Mr. B.P. Singh, learned counsel for the petitioner. Also heard Mr. Saumya Rai, learned Dejit Lawyer for respondent No. 1 / State. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the continuation of the present criminal proceedings is wholly illegal, arbitrary and an abuse of the process of law, as even a bare reading of the FIR and charge-sheet does not disclose the essential ingredients of the alleged offences under Sections 69 and 89 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita. Rather, the material on record unequivocally reflects a long-standing consensual relationship between two major individuals which commenced in the year 2017 and continued for nearly eight years without any allegation of force,



	coercion, threat or absence of consent at any point of time. It is contended that the complainant, who is herself a Police Constable and fully aware of her legal rights, voluntarily accompanied the petitioner and engaged in physical relations out of her free will, and the FIR has been lodged after an inordinate and unexplained delay of about eight years, without assigning any plausible reason for such belated reporting, clearly indicating malafide intention and an attempt to give criminal colour to a failed relationship. The allegation of false promise of marriage is vague and omnibus, lacking any material to show that there was dishonest or fraudulent intention on the part of the petitioner at the inception of the relationship, which is a sine qua non for constituting such offence, as consistently held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Pramod Suryabhan Pawar v. State of Maharashtra, reported in 2019 (9) SCC 608, Sonu @ Subhash Kumar v. State of Uttar Pradesh reported in (2021) 18 SCC 517, Amol Bhagwan Nehul v. State of
--	--



	Maharashtra (2025) 18 SCC 517, and Lalu Yadav v. State of Uttar Pradesh (2024) SCC OnLine SC 2876, wherein it has been categorically held that a consensual relationship turning sour or a subsequent refusal to marry, in absence of initial deceit, cannot attract criminal liability. It is further submitted that the medical examination report does not indicate any injury or signs of forceful sexual assault, thereby demolishing the prosecution story, and therefore, even if the entire prosecution case is taken at its face value, no prima facie case is made out against the petitioner and the impugned proceedings deserve to be quashed in the interest of justice. In view of the above, issue notice to the respondent No.2 by ordinary post as well as speed post. Learned State counsel appears and accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.1, therefore, issuance of notice to it, is dispensed with. Process Fee be paid within a week only for
--	---



Anu	respondent No.2. Notice be made returnable in four weeks. Two weeks' time is granted to the learned State counsel as well as respondents No.2 to file their reply-affidavit and thereafter, two weeks' time is granted to the learned counsel for the petitioners to file rejoinder affidavit. List the matter thereafter. Till then, further proceedings of sessions Trial No. 100/2025 pending in the Court of learned Additional and Sessions Judge, (F.T.C.) Balod, District- Balod (C.G.) in respect of the petitioner, namely, Dilip Kumar Uike, shall remain stayed. <table><tr><td>Sd/-</td><td>Sd/-</td></tr><tr><td>(Ravindra Kumar Agrawal)</td><td>(Ramesh Sinha)</td></tr><tr><td>Judge</td><td>Chief Justice</td></tr></table>	Sd/-	Sd/-	(Ravindra Kumar Agrawal)	(Ramesh Sinha)	Judge	Chief Justice
Sd/-	Sd/-						
(Ravindra Kumar Agrawal)	(Ramesh Sinha)						
Judge	Chief Justice						