



HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

CRMP No. 1657 of 2026

Shashilata Manikpuri W/o Jalgam Rajeev Aged About 31 Years
(Wrongly Mentioned In Certified Copy As Shashilata Makinpuri), R/o
Shriram Nagar, New Changorabhatha, Police Station D D Nagar,
District Raipur Chhattisgarh

... Petitioner

versus

1 - State of Chhattisgarh Through Superintendent of Police, District
Raipur Chhattisgarh

2 - Station House Officer Police Station D D Nagar, District Raipur
Chhattisgarh

3 - Jyotikala Manikpuri D/o Late Balbhadra Das Manikpuri Aged
About 31 Years R/o House No. E W S Block-A, Indraprastha Phase-
2, Raipura, Police Station D D Nagar, District Raipur Chhattisgarh

... Respondents

(Cause-title taken from Case Information System)

Order Sheet

29.06.2026	Heard Mr. Rajkumar Sahu, learned counsel for the petitioner as well as Mr. Ashish Shukla, learned Additional Advocate General, appearing for the State/respondents No.1 and 2.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the entire prosecution is a manifest abuse of the process of law and has been instituted with an ulterior motive to harass the present petitioner. It is contended that even if the allegations contained in the FIR are taken at their face value and accepted in their entirety, no prima facie case is made out against the petitioner warranting continuation of the criminal proceedings. The petitioner has been falsely implicated on the basis of omnibus and bald allegations without any specific overt act attributable to her.

It is further submitted that the charge-sheet has been filed in a routine and mechanical manner without conducting a fair and impartial investigation and the learned Judicial Magistrate has also mechanically taken cognizance without examining whether the essential ingredients of the alleged offences under Sections 296, 351(3), 115(2) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 are made out against the

petitioner. It is argued that continuation of the proceedings would amount to permitting misuse of the criminal justice system and unnecessary harassment of the petitioner.

Learned counsel further submits that the falsity of the prosecution case is apparent from the material collected by the Investigating Agency itself. Attention is invited to the statement of the complainant's own brother, Sonu Das Manikpuri, recorded during investigation, wherein he categorically stated that neither he nor Sharma Das had witnessed the alleged incident as both were inside the dining hall and had no knowledge of the occurrence. Despite such exculpatory material, their names were deliberately introduced in the FIR as eyewitnesses, thereby exposing the malicious nature of the prosecution.

It is further contended that a cross-FIR bearing No. 0154/2026 was also registered in respect of the very same incident against the complainant's principal witnesses, namely Atul Kumar Shukla and Nagendra

Tandon, for outraging the modesty of Preeti Manikpuri, which clearly demonstrates that the occurrence was a free fight and that the present FIR is merely a retaliatory counterblast. In these circumstances, it is submitted that allowing the impugned criminal proceedings to continue would amount to abuse of the process of Court and, therefore, the FIR dated 23.02.2026, Charge-sheet No.129/2026 dated 06.04.2026, the cognizance order dated 08.04.2026 and all consequential proceedings pending before the learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Raipur, deserve to be quashed in exercise of the inherent jurisdiction of this Court.

On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes the petition and submits that the FIR and the material collected during investigation disclose a prima facie case against the petitioner. It is contended that the disputed questions of fact raised by the petitioner can be adjudicated only during trial and do not warrant interference in exercise of the inherent

jurisdiction of this Court. It is, therefore, prayed that the petition, being devoid of merit, deserves to be dismissed.

In view of the above, issue notice to the respondents by ordinary as well as speed post.

Learned State counsel appears and accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.1 & 2, therefore, issuance of notice to respondents No.1 & 2, is dispensed with.

Process fee be paid as per Rules only for respondent No.3.

Two weeks' time is granted to the learned State counsel as well as respondent No.3 to file their reply-affidavits and thereafter, one week's time is granted to the learned counsel for the petitioner to file rejoinder-affidavit.

List the matter thereafter.

Till the next date of listing, the further proceedings of Criminal Case No.14923/2026 pending

before the learned Judicial Magistrate First Class,
Raipur (C.G.) insofar as relates to the petitioner, shall
remain stayed.

Sd/-
(Ravindra Kumar Agrawal)
Judge

Sd/-
(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice