

GAHC010064502026



undefined

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

Case No. : Crl.Pet./490/2026

SRI BIRAJ GOGOI
S/O- LATE JOGENDRA NATH GOGOI, R/O- NA-DIGHALA GAON, P.S..
BARBARUAH, DISTRICT- DIBRUGARH, ASSAM

VERSUS

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

2:SRI THOMAS RANJAN GOGOI
S/O- LATE JATIN GOGOI

R/O- BORPATHAR

NA-DIGHALA GAON
P.S. BARBARUAH
DISTRICT- DIBRUGARH
ASSA

Advocate for the Petitioner : MR. B CHOWDHURY, MR A BASUMATARY,MR. K KALITA

Advocate for the Respondent : PP, ASSAM,

:: BEFORE ::
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHIVJYOTI SAIKIA
O R D E R

02.04.2026

Heard Mr. B. Chowdhury, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner. Also heard Mr. K. Baishya, the learned Addl. Public Prosecutor, Assam.

2. This is an application under Section 528 of the BNSS, 2023 praying for quashing the criminal proceedings of Sessions Case No.187/2024 pending in the court of the learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Dibrugarh.

3. On 31.12.2023 at about 11 P.M., the petitioner attacked the informant with a sword causing sharp weapon injuries. The informant, in his evidence, has supported the prosecution case against the present petitioner.

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. Reverting to the case in hand, this Court is of the opinion that there are elements of a *prima facie* criminal case against the present petitioner Sri Biraj Gogoi. Therefore, this is not a fit case for exercising the power under Section 528 of the BNSS, 2023. The criminal petition is dismissed and disposed of accordingly.

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant