



HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

CRMP No. 608 of 2026

Mankunda Sai Kumar **Versus** State Of Chhattisgarh
Order Sheet

27.02.2026	Heard Mr. Anshul Tiwari, learned counsel for the petitioner. Also heard Mr. Samuya Rai, learned Government Advocate, appearing for respondent No.1/State and perused the FIR as well as material brought on record. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there is a matrimonial dispute between petitioner No.1 / husband and respondent No. 2 / wife and marriage between them was solemnized on 14.02.2024 and the present FIR has been lodged by respondent No. 2 against the petitioners for harassment on 30.08.2024. He further submits that the F.I.R., chargesheet, and all subsequent proceedings are nothing but an abuse of the process of law, as no offence under Sections 498A, 34, 323 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, or Section 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961, is made out. Even if the allegations in the F.I.R. are taken at face value, they

are insufficient to constitute any offence, and the Petitioners have been falsely implicated in the matter. The essential ingredients of “cruelty” under Section 498A are wholly absent, and there is no evidence, direct or indirect, linking the Petitioners to any alleged wrongdoing. The marriage between the parties was an arranged alliance, facilitated through a mediator named Balkrishna, and the parties had no prior acquaintance. Further, the complainant herself admitted that the marriage was imposed upon her by her parents. As per mutual agreement, the matrimonial arrangements, including venue, logistics, and hospitality, were to be organized by the Petitioners’ father, while the financial outlay was to be borne by the Respondent’s father, and the sums exchanged were either reimbursement or advance for wedding expenditures. Moreover, the complainant maintained a prior love relationship with one Prashant Kumar Rao and had expressed a desire to live with him, facts which are capable of proof through contemporaneous communications and statements. In view of these circumstances, and in line with the principles laid down by the Hon’ble Supreme Court in ***State of Haryana v. Bhajan Lal (1992 SCC (Cri) 426)***, the F.I.R., charge-sheet, and all subsequent proceedings do not disclose any prima facie offence and are liable to be quashed. He

lastly submits that the present matter be referred to the Mediation & Conciliation Centre of this Court being matrimonial in nature as there may be chances of compromise between the parties.

Considering the fact that the dispute arrived between the parties *i.e.* petitioner No.1 / husband and respondent No. 2 / wife 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 No.1 shall deposit **Rs. 1,00,000/-** with the Mediation Centre of this Court and the same shall be paid to respondent No. 2 on her appearance before the Mediation Centre.

The matter is remitted to the Mediation Centre with the direction that the Mediation Centre shall conclude the mediation and conciliation proceedings expeditiously, after giving notices to both the parties.

Parties are directed to appear before the Mediation Centre of this Court on **20.03.2026**.

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

List this matter along with report of Mediation Centre before this Court on **07.04.2026**.

Till the next date of listing, further proceedings against the petitioners in relation to Criminal Case No.

936/2025, pending before the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Dallirajhara, District- Balod (C.G.) arising out of the FIR as well as charge-sheet No. 278/2024 dated 03.12.2024 registered in Crime No. 225/2024 under Sections 498A, 34 of the IPC and Section 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 at Police Station- Rajhara, District- Balod (C.G.), shall remain stayed.

After depositing the amount as aforesaid, notice shall be issued to the parties.

It is made clear that in case the aforesaid amount is not deposited within the aforesaid period, the interim protection granted as above shall automatically be vacated and this petition shall stand dismissed without further reference to any Bench of this Court.

The petitioner is directed to produce the copy of the receipt before the trial Court concerned regarding payment of the said money before the Mediation Centre of this Court in pursuance of this Court's order, then only this order shall be given into effect.

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

Manpreet