

GAHC010021562026



undefined

THE GAUHATI HIGH COURT
(HIGH COURT OF ASSAM, NAGALAND, MIZORAM AND ARUNACHAL PRADESH)

Case No. : Crl.Pet./204/2026

THULEN DAS
S/O LATE NARENDRA DAS
R/O VILL- 2 NO., BANTOW GAON, P.S. DHAKUAKHANA
DIST.LAKHIMPUR, ASSAM

VERSUS

THE STATE OF ASSAM AND ANR
REP BY THE PP, ASSAM

2:SURABHI TAMULI
D/O LATE DIPEN TAMULI
R/O VILL- GARAMUR BARSARTRA
P.S. MAJULI

DIST. MAJULI
ASSA

Advocate for the Petitioner : MR MINTU SAIKIA, MS R DUTTA
Advocate for the Respondent : PP, ASSAM,

:: BEFORE ::

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHIVJYOTI SAIKIA

O R D E R

13.02.2026

Heard Mr. M. Saikia, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner. Also heard Mr. K.K. Das, the learned Addl. Public Prosecutor, Assam.

2. This is an application under Section 528 of the BNSS, 2023 praying for quashing the proceedings of Sessions Case No.32/2025 arising out of FIR No.43/2025 dated 09.09.2025 in respect of Garamur P.S. Case No.43/2025 and the *Charge Sheet* No.41/2025.
3. The FIR lodged by the Respondent No.2 discloses that the present petitioner had promised to marry her and on that promise, he had physical relationship with her for a long time. The petitioner was already a married person. But he had hidden that fact from the girl (informant) and continued his relationship for a long period of time. Subsequently, the girl discovered that the petitioner was a married person.
4. I have considered the submissions made by the learned counsel of both sides.
5. The guidelines for consideration of a petition under Section 482 of the CrPC has been laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *State of Haryana v. Bhajan Lal*, AIR 1992 SC 604. Paragraph 102 of the judgment reads as under:

“102. In the backdrop of the interpretation of the various relevant provisions of the Code under Chapter XIV and of the principles of law enunciated by this Court in a series of decisions relating to the exercise of the extraordinary power under Article 226 or the inherent powers under Section 482 of the Code which we have extracted and reproduced above, we give the following categories of cases by way of illustration wherein such power could be exercised either to prevent abuse of the process of any court or otherwise to secure the ends of justice, though it may not be possible to lay down any precise, clearly defined and sufficiently channelised and inflexible guidelines or rigid formulae and to give an exhaustive list of myriad kinds of cases wherein such power should be exercised.

- (1) Where the allegations made in the first information report or the complaint, even if they are taken at their face value and accepted in their entirety do not prima facie constitute any offence or make out a case against the accused.
- (2) Where the allegations in the first information report and other materials, if any, accompanying the FIR do not disclose a cognizable offence, justifying an investigation by police officers under Section 156(1) of the Code except under an order of a Magistrate within the purview of Section 155(2) of the Code.
- (3) Where the uncontroverted allegations made in the FIR or complaint and the evidence collected in support of the same do not disclose the commission of any offence and make out a case against the accused.
- (4) Where, the allegations in the FIR do not constitute a cognizable offence but constitute only a non-cognizable offence, no investigation is permitted by a police

officer without an order of a Magistrate as contemplated under Section 155(2) of the Code.

(5) Where the allegations made in the FIR or complaint are so absurd and inherently improbable on the basis of which no prudent person can ever reach a just conclusion that there is sufficient ground for proceeding against the accused.

(6) Where there is an express legal bar engrafted in any of the provisions of the Code or the concerned Act (under which a criminal proceeding is instituted) to the institution and continuance of the proceedings and/or where there is a specific provision in the Code or the concerned Act, providing efficacious redress for the grievance of the aggrieved party.

(7) Where a criminal proceeding is manifestly attended with mala fide and/or where the proceeding is maliciously instituted with an ulterior motive for wreaking vengeance on the accused and with a view to spite him due to private and personal grudge.”

6. On a plain reading of the said FIR, elements of a clear criminal case is visible against the present petitioner. There is a *prima facie* case against him. Therefore, this is not a fit case for exercising the extra-ordinary power under Section 528 of the BNSS, 2023.

7. This Court is of the opinion that the criminal petition case being devoid of any merit, stands dismissed accordingly.

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant