

Suman Sood and her husband Daya Singh Lahoria were accused in the case of abduction. They were tried for offence under Section 364A, 365, 343 read with Section 120-B and 346 read with Section 120-B. The trial court convicted the appellant for offence under Sections 365 read with 120-B, 343 read with 120-B and 346 read with 120-B. She was, however, acquitted for offence punishable under Section 364-A. Her challenge against conviction and sentence for offences punishable under Sections 365 read with 120-B, 343 read with 120-B and 346 read with 120-B IPC was negatived by the High Court. But her acquittal for offences punishable under Sections 364-A read with 120-B was set aside by the High Court in an appeal and she was also convicted for the offence under Section 364A and was sentenced to life imprisonment. In the appeal filed by her challenging her conviction under Section 364A, this Court dealt with acquittal of Suman Sood under Section 364A by trial Court. In Paragraph 64 this court noticed as follows:-

“64. According to the trial court, the prosecution had failed to prove charges against Suman Sood for an offence punishable under Sections 364-A or 364-A read with 120-B IPC “beyond reasonable doubt” inasmuch as no reliable evidence had been placed on record from which it could be said to have been established that Suman Sood was also a part of “pressurise tactics” or had terrorised the victim or his family members to get Devendra Pal Singh Bhullar released in lieu of Rajendra Mirdha. The trial court, therefore, held that she was entitled to benefit of doubt.”

The findings of trial court that no reliable evidence had been placed on record from which it could be said to have been established that Suman Sood was also a part of pressurise tactics or has terrorized the victim or his family. This court approved the acquittal of Suman Sood by trial court and set aside the order of the High Court convicting Suman Sood. In paragraph 71 following was held by this Court:-

“71. On the facts and in the circumstances in its entirety and considering the evidence as a whole, it cannot be said that by acquitting Suman Sood for offences punishable under Sections 364-A read with 120-B IPC, the trial court had acted illegally or unlawfully. The High Court, therefore, ought not to have set aside the finding of acquittal of accused Suman Sood for an offence under Sections 364-A read with 120-B IPC. To that extent, therefore, the order of conviction and sentence recorded by the High Court deserves to be set aside.”

Thus, the trial court's findings that there was no evidence that Suman Sood was part of pressurize tactics or terrorized the victim or his family members, hence, due to non-fulfillment of the condition as enumerated in Section 364A, the trial court recorded the acquittal, which has been confirmed by this Court. The above case clearly establishes that unless all conditions as enumerated in Section 364A are fulfilled, no conviction can be recorded.

Suman Sood alias Kamaljeet Kaur Vs. State of Rajasthan (2007) 5 SCC 634.