



CGHC010255892026

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**CRMP No. 1777 of 2026**

1 - Lokesh Chandrakar S/o - Kuleshwar Chandrakar, Aged About 34 Years R/o - House No. 331, Mukut Nagar, Ward No. 43, Maharaja Chowk Durg, Padmanabhpur Durg, Tehsil And District - Durg, Chhattisgarh

2 - Kuleshwar Chandrakar, S/o- Madhusudan Chandrakar, Aged About 56 Years R/o - House No. 331, Mukut Nagar, Ward No. 43, Maharaja Chowk Durg, Padmanabhpur Durg, Tehsil And District - Durg, Chhattisgarh

3 - Smt. Hemlata Chandrakar, W/o- Kuleshwar Chandrakar , Aged About 55 Years R/o - House No. 331, Mukut Nagar, Ward No. 43, Maharaja Chowk Durg, Padmanabhpur Durg, Tehsil And District - Durg, Chhattisgarh

... Petitioners**versus**

1 - State of Chhattisgarh Through - S. H. O. Police Station - Mahila Thana, Durg District -Durg, C.G.

2 - Smt. Rewati Chandrakar, W/o - Lokesh Chandrakar, Aged About 30 Years R/o- Plot No. 2, Street No. 2, Saraswati Kunj, West Risali Bhilai, Newai, Durg District -Durg, C.G. (Complainant)

... Respondents**Order Sheet**

09/07/2026	Heard Mr. Pushkar Sinha, learned counsel for the petitioners as well as Mr. Saumya Rai, learned Deputy Government Advocate, appearing for the State/ respondent No.1.

	Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the impugned FIR, the consequential charge-sheet, the order taking cognizance dated 14.10.2025, and the order framing charges dated 21.01.2026 are liable to be quashed as the allegations made against the petitioners are omnibus, vague, and devoid of specific particulars constituting the alleged offences. It is contended that the prosecution has falsely implicated not only petitioner No.1 (husband) but also petitioner Nos.2 and 3 (parents-in-law) without attributing any distinct overt act to them. The learned counsel further submits that the allegations regarding demand of dowry and cruelty are general in nature and are not supported by any independent material collected during investigation. It is also argued that the alleged transfer of Rs.4,80,000/- from the complainant's account is a matter requiring independent proof and does not, by itself, establish the ingredients of the offences under Section 85 read with Section 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Section 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act. It is further submitted that petitioner No.1 has already been granted anticipatory bail
--	--

by this Hon'ble Court, and during the mediation proceedings, he *bona fide* deposited an amount of Rs.1,00,000/- in an effort to amicably resolve the matrimonial dispute, which itself reflects the absence of any criminal intent. It is, therefore, contended that continuation of the criminal proceedings would amount to an abuse of the process of law, and this Hon'ble Court, in exercise of its inherent jurisdiction, may be pleased to quash the impugned proceedings in the interest of justice.

Issue notice to respondent No.2 on payment of PF as per rules. Notice be made returnable within four weeks.

List the matter thereafter.

Till then, further criminal proceedings in Criminal Case No. RCC/34191/2025 pending before learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Durg, District – Durg (C.G.) shall remain stayed.

Sd/-
(Ravindra Kumar Agrawal)
Judge

Sd/-
(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice