



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA

KALABURAGI BENCH

DATED THIS THE 27TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH RAI K

CRIMINAL PETITION NO. 201980 OF 2025

(482(Cr.PC)/528(BNSS))

BETWEEN:

1. MAHESH
S/O CHANNAPPA MANUR
AGE: 29 YEARS, OCC: BUSINESS
R/O JALAWAD, TQ: DEVAR HIPPARAGI
DIST: VIJAYAPURA-586101
2. MANJUNATH
S/O CHANNAPPA MANUR
AGE: 33 YEARS, OCC: BUSINESS
R/O JALAWAD, TQ: DEVAR HIPPARAGI
DIST: VIJAYAPURA-586101
3. MAHANTESH
S/O CHANNAPPA MANUR
AGE: 35 YEARS, OCC: AGRICULTURE
R/O JALAWAD, TQ: DEVAR HIPPARAGI
DIST: VIJAYAPURA-586101

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. SHIVANAND V. PATTANSHETTI., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA THROUGH
VIJAYAPUR WOMEN POLICE STATION
DIST: VIJAYAPURA-586101.
R/BY ADDL. SPP





HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA
KALABURAGI BENCH-585107

2. VANISHREE
D/O DHAREPPA KARIKUBBI
AGE: 23 YEARS, OCC: PRIVATE WORK
R/O JALAWAD, TQ: DEVAR HIPPARAGI
DIST: VIJAYAPURA
PRESENTLY AT AALAKUNTE NAGAR
VIJAYAPURA-586101

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI.JAMADAR SHAHABUDDIN, HCGP FOR R1;
SRI. MANVENDRA REDDY ADV., FOR R2)

THIS CRL.P IS FILED U/S.482 OF CR.P.C. (OLD), U/SEC. 528 OF BNSS (NEW), PRAYING TO QUASH THE COMPLAINT, FIR AND FILING OF CHARGE SHEET NOW PENDING IN C.C.NO. 4116/2025 (WOMAN PS CRIME NO.21/2025 DISTRICT VIJAYAPURA) ON THE FILE OF IV ADDL. CIVIL JUDGE AND JMFC-III VIJAYAPURA FOR THE OFFENCES PUNISHABLE U/SECS.376(2)(N), 417, 504 R/W 34 OF IPC.

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR ADMISSION, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH RAI K

ORAL ORDER

This petition is filed under Section 528 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to quash the proceedings against the petitioners/accused Nos.1 to 3 in C.C. No.4116/2025, arising out of Crime No.21/2025, registered by Women Police, Vijayapura, for the offences



punishable under sections 376(2)(n), 417, 504 and 506 read with Section 34 of IPC, pending on the file of IV Additional Civil Judge and JMFC, Vijayapura.

2. The factual matrix of the case is, respondent No.2 lodged the complaint before respondent No.1-Police on 28.02.2025 alleging that, petitioner No.1/accused No.1 introduced her through Instagram and gradually they become friends. Thereafter, their friendship turned into love and on the promise of marriage, petitioner No.1/accused No.1 had sexual intercourse with her. Later, they both were sexually active for a period of 4 to 5 years and thereafter, petitioner No.1 failed to marry her. When she and her family members question accused No.1 and his family members i.e., petitioner Nos.2 and 3, they abused and foisted life threat to her. Based on the complaint, respondent No.1-Police investigated the case and laid charge sheet against the petitioners and learned Sessions Judge took cognizance of the offences. Hence, this petition.



3. The contention of the learned counsel for the petitioners is that, on perusal of the complaint averments and charge sheet materials, it is clear that, respondent No.2 was major at the time of incident and she and petitioner No.1 were developed intimacy and both were sexually active for more than two years. As such, the consensual act will not come within the ambit either under Section 376(2)(n), 470 or 504 of IPC. Accordingly, he prays to quash the proceedings.

4. *Per contra*, learned counsel for respondent No.2 and learned HCGP jointly opposed the prayer alleging that investigation is completed and charge sheet has been laid against the petitioners. Further they contended that, petitioner No.1 by inducing respondent No.2 that he would marry her, committed sexual act with her. In such circumstance, the proceedings cannot be quashed and accordingly, he prays to dismiss the petition.



5. I have given my anxious consideration both on the submissions made by the learned counsel for the respective parties and the documents available on record.

6. As could be gathered from the charge sheet materials, it is not in dispute that respondent No.2 was major i.e., 19 years at the time of incident and she got introduced herself to petitioner No.1 through the social media platform and thereafter they became intimate and started loving each other and had consensual sexual act. Nowhere in the complaint or in the charge sheet, it is stated that the petitioner had such an intention cheating her and thereby committed sexual intercourse with her. Hence, the provision of Section 417 or 376(2)(n) or 504 Indian Penal Code, 1860 does not attract, as held by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Shiva Prathap Singh Rana V/s State of Madhya Pradesh and Another** reported in **(2024) 8 SCC 313** in paragraphs No.26 to 33 as under.



"26. We have carefully gone through the definition of "rape" provided under Section 375 IPC. We have also gone through the provisions of Section 376(2)(n) IPC, which deals with the offence of rape committed repeatedly on the same woman. Section 375 IPC defines "rape" by a man if he does any of the acts in terms of clauses (a) to (d) under the seven descriptions mentioned therein. As per the second description, a man commits rape if he does any of the acts as mentioned in clauses (a) to (d) without the consent of the woman. Consent has been defined in Explanation 2 to mean an unequivocal voluntary agreement when the woman by words, gestures or any form of verbal or nonverbal communication, communicates willingness to participate in the specific sexual act. However, the proviso thereto clarifies that a woman who does not physically resist to the act of penetration shall not by the reason only of that fact, be regarded as consenting to the sexual activity.

27. Having regard to the above and in the overall conspectus of the case, we are of the view that the physical relationship between the prosecutrix and the appellant cannot be said to be against her will and without her consent. On the basis of the available materials, no case of rape or of criminal intimidation is made out.

28. The learned counsel for the respondents had placed considerable reliance on the provisions of Section 90IPC, particularly on the expression "under a misconception of fact". Section 90IPC reads thus:

"90. Consent known to be given under fear or misconception.—A consent is not such a consent as it intended by any section of this Code, if the consent is given by a person



under fear of injury, or under a misconception of fact, and if the person doing the act knows, or has reason to believe, that the consent was given in consequence of such fear or misconception; or Consent of insane person.—if the consent is given by a person who, from unsoundness of mind, or intoxication, is unable to understand the nature and consequence of that to which he gives his consent; or Consent of child.—unless the contrary appears from the context, if the consent is given by a person who is under twelve years of age.”

29. *Section 90 IPC says that a consent is not such a consent as it is intended by any section of IPC, if the consent is given by a person under the fear of injury or under a misconception of fact.*

30. *In Dhruvaram Murlidhar Sonar v. State of Maharashtra [Dhruvaram Murlidhar Sonar v. State of Maharashtra, (2019) 18 SCC 191 : (2020) 3 SCC (Cri) 672] , this Court after examining Section 90IPC held as follows : (SCC p. 198, para 17) “17. Thus, Section 90 though does not define “consent”, but describes what is not “consent”. Consent may be express or implied, coerced or misguided, obtained willingly or through deceit. If the consent is given by the complainant under misconception of fact, it is vitiated. Consent for the purpose of Section 375 requires voluntary participation not only after the exercise of intelligence based on the knowledge of the significance and moral quality of the act, but also after having fully exercised the choice between resistance and assent. Whether there was any consent or not is to be ascertained only on a careful study of all relevant circumstances.”*



31. *This Court also examined the interplay between Section 375IPC and Section 90IPC in the context of consent in Pramod Suryabhan Pawar v. State of Maharashtra [Pramod Suryabhan Pawar v. State of Maharashtra, (2019) 9 SCC 608 : (2019) 3 SCC (Cri) 903] , and held that consent with respect to Section 375IPC involves an active understanding of the circumstances, actions and consequences of the proposed act. An individual who makes a reasoned choice to act after evaluating various alternative actions (or inaction) as well as the various possible consequences flowing from such action (or inaction), consents to such action. After deliberating upon the various case laws, this Court summed up the legal position as under : (SCC p. 620, para 18)*

"18. To summarise the legal position that emerges from the above cases, the "consent" of a woman with respect to Section 375 must involve an active and reasoned deliberation towards the proposed act. To establish whether the "consent" was vitiated by a "misconception of fact" arising out of a promise to marry, two propositions must be established. The promise of marriage must have been a false promise, given in bad faith and with no intention of being adhered to at the time it was given. The false promise itself must be of immediate relevance, or bear a direct nexus to the woman's decision to engage in the sexual act."

32. *The learned counsel for the respondents had relied heavily on the expression "misconception of fact". However, according to*



us, there is no misconception of fact here. Right from the inception, it is the case of the prosecution that while the appellant was insisting on having a relationship with the prosecutrix, the later had turned down the same on the ground that the appellant was the friend of her younger brother and a distant relative of her jijaji. That apart, according to the prosecutrix, the appellant was younger to her. Nonetheless, the prosecutrix had accompanied the appellant to a temple, where she had voluntarily taken bath under a waterfall. Her allegation that the appellant had surreptitiously taken photographs of her while she was bathing and later on changing clothes and was blackmailing her with such photographs remain unfounded in the absence of seizure of such photographs or the mobile phone on which such photographs were taken by the appellant. If, indeed, she was under some kind of threat from the appellant, it defies any logic, when the prosecutrix accompanied the appellant to Gwalior from Dabra, a journey which they had made together by train. On reaching Gwalior, she accompanied the appellant on a scooter to a rented premises at Anupam Nagar, where she alleged that the appellant had forced himself upon her. But she did not raise any alarm or hue and cry at any point of time. Rather, she returned back to Dabra along with the appellant. The relationship did not terminate there. It continued even thereafter. It is the case of the prosecutrix herself that at one point of time the family members of the two had met to discuss about their marriage but nothing final could be reached regarding their marriage. It was only thereafter that the FIR was lodged.

33. *As already pointed out above, neither the affidavit nor stamp papers have been recovered or seized by the police; so also the jewellery. The alleged cheque of the prosecutrix's mother given to the appellant or the bank*



statement to indicate transfer of such money have not been gathered by the police. In the absence of such materials, the entire substratum of the prosecutrix's case collapses. Thus, there is hardly any possibility of conviction of the appellant. As a matter of fact, it is not even a case which can stand trial. It appears to be a case of a consensual relationship which had gone sour leading to lodging of FIR. In the circumstances, the Court is of the view that compelling the appellant to face the criminal trial on these materials would be nothing but an abuse of the process of the court, result of the trial being a foregone conclusion."

7. Further, the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***Deepak Gulati vs. State of Haryana*** reported in **2013 Crl. Law Journal 2990**, held in para Nos.18 and 21 as under:

"18. Consent may be express or implied, coerced or misguided, obtained willingly or through deceit. Consent is an act of reason, accompanied by deliberation, the mind weighing, as in a balance, the good and evil on each side. There is a clear distinction between rape and consensual sex and in a case like this, the court must very carefully examine whether the accused had actually wanted to marry the victim, or had mala fide motives, and had made a false promise to this effect only to satisfy his lust, as the latter falls within the ambit of cheating or deception. There is a distinction between the mere breach of a promise, and not fulfilling a false promise. Thus, the court must examine whether there was made, at an early stage a false promise of marriage by the accused; and whether the consent involved was given after



wholly, understanding the nature and consequences of sexual indulgence. There may be a case where the prosecutrix agrees to have sexual intercourse on account of her love and passion for the accused, and not solely on account of mis-representation made to her by the accused, or where an accused on account of circumstances which he could not have foreseen, or which were beyond his control, was unable to marry her, despite having every intention to do so. Such cases must be treated differently. An accused can be convicted for rape only if the court reaches a conclusion that the intention of the accused was mala fide, and that he had clandestine motives.

21. *Hence, it is evident that there must be adequate evidence to show that at the relevant time, i.e. at initial stage itself, the accused had no intention whatsoever, of keeping his promise to marry the victim. There may, of course, be circumstances, when a person having the best of intentions is unable to marry the victim owing to various unavoidable circumstances. The "failure to keep a promise made with respect to a future uncertain date, due to reasons that are not very clear from the evidence available, does not always amount to misconception of fact. In order to come within the meaning of the term misconception of fact, the fact must have an immediate relevance." Section 90 IPC cannot be called into aid in such a situation, to pardon the act of a girl in entirety, and fasten criminal liability on the other, unless the court is assured of the fact that from the very beginning, the accused had never really intended to marry her."*

8. Collocating the above findings of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the above judgments to the facts and



circumstances of the case, in my considered view, even if the entire allegations in FIR and charge sheet taken on its face value, no offences have been made out against the petitioners/accused Nos.1 to 3. As such, continuation of proceedings against them is abuse of process of Court. Accordingly, I proceed to pass the following:

ORDER

- a. The petition is ***allowed***.
- b. The proceedings against the petitioners/accused Nos.1 to 3 in C.C. No.4116/2025, arising out of Crime No.21/2025, registered by Women Police, Vijayapura, for the offences punishable under sections 376(2)(n), 417, 504 and 506 read with Section 34 of IPC, pending on the file of IV Additional Civil Judge and JMFC, Vijayapura, is hereby quashed.

**Sd/-
(RAJESH RAI K)
JUDGE**