



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

CRLMC No.458 of 2026

Dr. Simanchalla Ranjit *Petitioner(s)*
Mr. Gajendranath Rout, Adv.

-versus-

State of Odisha & Ors. *Opposite Party(s)*
Smt. Sarita Moharana, ASC
Name of the Advocate
for O.P. No.3 not given

CORAM:

HON'BLE DR.JUSTICE SANJEEB K PANIGRAHI

Order
No.

ORDER
09.03.2026

02. 1. This matter is taken up through hybrid arrangement.
2. In filing this CRLMC, the Petitioner against whom the allegation of theft of the vehicle in question is made, has prayed for quashing the entire criminal proceeding initiated against him vide G.R. Case No.2117/2025 arising out of Bhadrak (R) P.S. Case No.514 of 2025 dated 07.09.2025 pending before the Court of learned S.D.J.M, Bhadrak.
3. Heard the parties and perused the records.
4. Challenging institution of the above noted criminal proceeding against the Petitioner, learned counsel for the Petitioner submits that since the Petitioner is an Advocate, the vehicle in question was provided to him by his client for attending a case on his behalf at Calcutta. He further



contends that the Petitioner was not aware of fact that said vehicle was a stolen vehicle. He further contends that the Petitioner has been entangled in this case only on suspicion. According to him, continuation of the proceeding would amount to an abuse of the process of Court and result in undue harassment to the Petitioner. On these premises, he prays that this Court may be pleased to allow the relief sought in the present CRLMC and quash the impugned proceeding in the interest of justice.

5. In opposition, learned counsel for the State submits that pursuant to the registration of the F.I.R., investigation has been duly conducted and culminated in submission of charge-sheet against the Petitioner. It is contended that at this stage, when the investigating agency has found prima facie materials and placed the same before the learned Court below, there exists no compelling or exceptional circumstance warranting exercise of inherent jurisdiction to quash the proceeding.

6. Learned counsel further submits that the veracity of the allegations, the defence plea of prior enmity, and the question of false implication are all matters to be adjudicated upon recording of evidence during the course of trial. According to her, premature interference would stifle a legitimate prosecution. She prays for dismissal of the present CRLMC.



7. Having considered the rival submissions advanced on behalf of the parties and upon perusal of the materials available on record, this Court finds that the investigation has culminated in submission of charge-sheet. At this juncture, the question as to whether the Petitioner has in fact committed the offences alleged against him is essentially a matter to be adjudicated upon appreciation of evidence during trial.

8. It is trite that evaluation of factual controversies, assessment of credibility of witnesses, and appreciation of evidence fall squarely within the domain of the trial court. The inherent jurisdiction of this Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is not intended to supplant the statutory procedure of trial or to conduct a mini-trial at the pre-trial stage.

9. The power under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is to be exercised sparingly, with circumspection, and only in rare cases where the complaint or charge-sheet on its face discloses no offence, or where there exists a legal bar to the institution or continuance of the proceeding, or where continuation of the prosecution would amount to a manifest abuse of the process of Court. In the absence of such exceptional circumstances, judicial restraint must prevail.

10. In the present case, this Court does not find any patent illegality, jurisdictional error, or legal embargo warranting



interference. However, considering the request of learned counsel for the Petitioner, this Court permits the Petitioner to file a petition for discharge before the learned Court in *seisin* over the matter which shall be considered and disposed of in accordance with law. Petitioner is also permitted to raise all the points raised herein before the learned Court in *seisin* over the matter at the time of framing of charges which shall be dealt with as per law.

11. Accordingly, this Court declines to exercise its inherent jurisdiction to quash the aforesaid criminal proceeding.

12. This CRLMC is, accordingly, dismissed.

(Dr. Sanjeeb K Panigrahi)
Judge