



**Serial No. 05**  
**Daily List**

**HIGH COURT OF MEGHALAYA**  
**AT SHILLONG**

CrI.Petn. No. 61 of 2025

Date of order: 16.03.2026

Bimlan Sohshang

**....Petitioner**

**- versus -**

1. State of Meghalaya represented by the Chief Secretary, Government of Meghalaya, Shillong.
2. The Officer-In-Charge, Mawkyrwat Police Station, South West Khasi Hills District, Meghalaya.
3. Smti. Dwip Lyngkhoi.

**....Respondents**

**Coram:**

**Hon'ble Mrs. Justice Revati Mohite Dere, Chief Justice**

**Appearance:**

For the Petitioner : Mr L. Syiem, Adv. with  
Mr K.V. Kharlyngdoh, Adv.

For the Respondents : Mr N. Syngkon, Asst. PP with  
Mr J.N. Rynjah, GA  
Ms B.L. Lyngkhoi, Adv. [for R3]

i) Whether approved for reporting in Law journals etc.: Yes

ii) Whether approved for publication in press: Yes

**JUDGMENT: (Oral)**

Heard learned counsel for the respective parties.



2. Rule. Rule is made returnable forthwith with the consent of the parties and the aforesaid petition is taken up for final disposal.

3. By this petition, the petitioner seeks quashing of the FIR registered vide P.S. Case No. 13(08) 2021 with the Mawkyrwat Women Police Station for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 307, 326, 354, 511, 506 of IPC. Quashing is sought on the premise, that the parties i.e., the petitioner and the respondent No. 3, have amicably settled their dispute.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner states that having regard to the FIR and the charge-sheet, no offences as alleged under Sections 307 and 326 of the IPC are disclosed and as such, there is no impediment in quashing the FIR and consequently, the proceeding arising therefrom.

5. Learned counsel appearing for the respondent No. 3 has filed an affidavit of the said respondent dated 5<sup>th</sup> March, 2026. In the said affidavit, the respondent No. 3 states that the petitioner and she had amicably resolved the dispute and that



she has 'no objection' to quashing of the said FIR registered at her behest with the Mawkyrwat Women Police Station and consequently, the proceeding arising therefrom.

6. Few facts as are necessary to decide the petition are as under:

According to the respondent No. 3 (original complainant), her husband expired on 26<sup>th</sup> August, 2020 and that from her late husband she has five children; that after the demise of her husband, she decided to stay with the petitioner and as such, was living with the petitioner as husband and wife for a while; and, that however, her relatives did not approve of their relationship, since the petitioner was married to one of her relatives. The respondent No. 3 has further alleged that the petitioner would abuse her and that her family members did not like the fact, that the petitioner would abuse her and as such, a clan meeting was held at her house for their separation i.e., separation of the petitioner and the respondent No. 3.

It is further the respondent No. 3's case that as the petitioner demanded ₹2 lakhs to leave his wife and children to



be with the respondent No. 3, in the clan meeting, the respondent No. 3's relatives decided that the respondent No. 3 should go and stay with her relative at Langlew village. According to the respondent No. 3, on 10<sup>th</sup> August, 2021 at about 1 p.m., when she was on her way to Langlew village along with her relatives and had reached Kyntai iai ground, the petitioner followed them and threatened with the knife and dragged her to a nearby forest. The respondent No. 3 has alleged that after the fight, the petitioner disclosed to her that he did not want to leave her and pursuant thereto, he gave two cuts on her left buttock; that they consumed alcohol and had consensual physical relationship after which they returned home. The injury certificate which is at page 54 of the petition shows that the respondent No. 3 had sustained no injuries on any part of her body. The said medical certificate was issued by the Mawkyrwat CHC, South West Khasi Hills. It further appears from the medical certificate which is annexed to the affidavit filed by the learned GA that when the respondent No. 3 was examined, she tested positive for alcohol; that she had two stashed (scratch)



wound on her left buttock and that there was no bleeding; and three bruise marks on the left arm.

7. It is well settled that a case under Section 307 IPC cannot be quashed even with the consent of the parties in view of the judgment of the Apex Court in ***Narinder Singh & ors v. State of Punjab & anr*** reported in ***(2014) 6 SCC 466***. However, in the very same judgment, it is observed that quashing is permissible only if after going through the FIR/charge-sheet, no offence under Section 307 IPC is made out.

8. In the present case, keeping the aforesaid facts in mind and the nature of injuries, it is evident that no case under Section 307 IPC is disclosed qua the petitioner. Neither an offence under Section 326 is made out. The offence, if any, would be a lesser offence and hence, keeping the aforesaid factors in mind and the medical certificates, quashing of the FIR and consequently, the proceeding arising therefrom, with the consent of the parties can be permitted.



9. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the FIR bearing P.S. Case No. 13(08) 2021 registered with the Mawkyrwat Women Police Station and consequently, the proceeding being Sessions Case No. 5 of 2022 pending before the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Mawkyrwat, are quashed and set aside subject to the petitioner depositing cost of ₹ 25,000/- directly into the account of the respondent No. 3 within four weeks from today.

10. Rule is made absolute on the aforesaid terms.

11. The petition is disposed of on the aforesaid terms.

12. List this matter on **14<sup>th</sup> April, 2026** for recording compliance of the payment of ₹ 25,000/- by the petitioner directly into respondent No. 3's bank account.

**(Revati Mohite Dere)**  
**Chief Justice**