



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

CRLMC No. 5266 of 2023

Sandesh K. Srinivas

Petitioner

*Mr. Manas Ranjan Nayak, Advocate,
on behalf of Mr. Smruti Ranjan Rout, Advocate
-versus-*

1. State of Odisha

2. Smaranika Sahoo

Opp. Parties

*Mr. Sarathi Jyoti Mohanty,
Additional Standing Counsel
(For Opposite Party No.1)*

*Mr. Sriram Krishna Jajodia, Advocate
(For Opposite Party No.2)*

CORAM:

HON'BLE MISS JUSTICE SAVITRI RATHO

ORDER

26.02.2026

Order No.

04.

(Through hybrid Mode)

1. Heard Mr. M.R. Nayak, learned counsel appearing on behalf of Mr. S.R. Rout, learned counsel for the Petitioner, Mr. S.J. Mohanty, learned Additional Standing Counsel for the State and Mr. S.K. Jajodia, learned counsel for Opposite Party No.2.
2. This CRLMC has been filed for quashing the order dated 21.04.2018 passed by the learned JMFC-1 (Cog. Taking), Cuttack in G.R. Case No.299 of 2018, which arises out of Markatnagar P.S. Case No.28 of 2018, taking cognizance of offences under Sections 341, 498-A, 323, 294, 307 and 506 of IPC against the Petitioner as well as for quashing the entire proceedings the case.
3. By judgment dated 18.12.2020 passed by the learned Judge, Family Court, Cuttack in C.P. No. 90 of 2018 the marriage of the Petitioner and Opposite Party No.2-Smaranika Sahoo has been



dissolved without any order towards permanent alimony.

4. Mr. Nayak, learned counsel for the Petitioner produced the copy of the judgment of the Supreme Court in the case of *Navneesh Aggarwal and others v. State of Haryana and another : 2025 SCC Online SC 1680* on which he relies. He submits that after the divorce between the parties as the parties are leading separate lives, the Opposite Party No.2 does not want to proceed with the G.R. case.

5. Mr. S.K. Jajodia, learned counsel for the Opposite Party No.2 submits that she is not interested to proceed with the case as the marriage between the Petitioner and her has been dissolved more than five years ago and they are leading their separate lives.

6. After hearing the learned counsel, in view of the decisions of the Supreme Court referred to above, as the marriage between the Petitioner has ended in a divorce and Opposite Party No.2 is not interested to proceed with the G.R. case, I am satisfied that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the GR case pending. I, therefore, consider this to be fit case where the proceedings in G.R. Case No. 299 of 2018 pending in the court of the learned JMFC-1 (Cog. Taking), Cuttack (arising out of Markatnagar P.S. Case No.28 of 2018) should be quashed, in the interest of justice.

7. The proceedings are accordingly quashed.

8. Judgment is pronounced in separate sheets.

9. Copy of this order be communicated to learned JMFC-1 (Cog. Taking), Cuttack forthwith by the Registry.

(Savitri Ratho)
Judge