



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

CRLMC No.2718 of 2025

*Jaydev Kumar Rang* .... *Petitioner(s)*  
*Mr. Prasanta Kumar Nanda, Adv.*  
*Mr. Debasnan Das, Adv.*  
*Miss Adyashakti Priya, Adv.*

-versus-

*State of Odisha & Anr.* .... *Opposite Party(s)*  
*Mr. Sonak Mishra, ASC*  
*Mr. Jagabandhu Sahu, Adv.*  
*Mr. Saroj Kumar Routray, Adv.*

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE DR.JUSTICE SANJEEB K PANIGRAHI**

Order  
No.

ORDER  
**26.02.2026**

05.      1. This matter is taken up through hybrid arrangement.
2. In the present CRLMC, the Petitioner has prayed for quashing the entire criminal proceeding initiated against him based on the allegation of keeping physical relationship with the informant/Opposite Party No.2 by giving her false promise of marriage, in connection with Podia P.S. Case No.109 of 2022 corresponding to G.R. Case No.623 of 2022 pending in the Court of learned J.M.F.C, Motu.
3. Heard.
4. At the outset, learned counsel for the Petitioner and learned counsel for the Opposite Party No.2 in one tone



submit that both the parties are ready for amicable settlement of the dispute involved herein. They also file a joint affidavit to that effect. It is also submitted that in the meantime, the Opposite Party No.2 has already married to another person. She is also leading a happy conjugal life. They, accordingly, pray for allowing the prayer made in this CRLMC.

5. It is well settled that although the offence under Section 376(2)(n) of the I.P.C is non-compoundable, the High Court, in exercise of its inherent jurisdiction under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C., is not denuded of power to quash the criminal proceeding where the dispute is essentially private and matrimonial in nature and the parties have voluntarily arrived at a genuine and complete settlement. The underlying object of such exercise is to secure the ends of justice and to prevent abuse of the process of the Court. Where the continuation of the criminal proceeding, despite an amicable settlement, would serve no fruitful purpose and would only perpetuate bitterness between the parties, the High Court would be justified in interdicting the prosecution, particularly when the informant herself has unequivocally expressed her consent for such quashing.

6. Considering the contents of the joint affidavit filed by the Petitioner and the Opposite Party No.2/ informant and following the ratio laid down by the Supreme Court in



*Gian Singh v. State of Punjab and another*<sup>1</sup>, and two other reported cases of this Court in *Lokanath @ Anadi Sethi and four others v. State of Orissa and four others*<sup>2</sup>, and *Sansuri alias Khageswar Lenka and another –vrs.- State of Orissa and Another*<sup>3</sup>, wherein this Court is of the opinion that no useful purpose will be served in allowing such proceedings to continue the criminal proceeding in the aforesaid case as it will only lead to abuse the process of law.

7. In view of the aforesaid discussion and considerations, the application is allowed. Accordingly, the entire criminal proceeding initiated against the Petitioner vide Podia P.S. Case No.109 of 2022 corresponding to G.R. Case No.623 of 2022 pending in the Court of learned J.M.F.C, Motu stands quashed.

6. This CRLMC is, accordingly, disposed of.

7. Interim order, if any, passed earlier stands vacated.

(Dr. Sanjeeb K Panigrahi)  
Judge

Ayaskanta

---

<sup>1</sup> (2012) 10 SCC 303

<sup>2</sup> 2014 (II) OLR 29

<sup>3</sup> 2014 (II) OLR 452