



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.Nos.24293 of 2017 and 23381 of 2018

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 23.11.2023

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE **G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN**

Crl.O.P.Nos.24293 of 2017 and 23381 of 2018

and

Crl.M.P.Nos.14037 of 2017, 13078 of 2018, 8634 and 16834 of 2022

Crl.O.P.No.24293 of 2017:-

1. Abhisek Ganguly,
Managing Director (Current),
PUMA Sports India Private Limited,
No.509, CMH Road,
Bengaluru-560038.

2. Atul Bajaj
Director by designation,
PUMA Sports India Private Limited,
No.509, CMH Road,
Bengaluru-560038.

... Petitioners

-Vs-

1. The Deputy Commissioner of Police,
Central Crime Branch-2,
Commissioner Office Building,
EVK Sampath Road, Vepery,
Chennai-600007.

2. The Inspector of Police,
CCB-I,
Chennai CCB,
Old Commissionerate Building,
Pantheon Road, Egmore,
Chennai-600008.

3. Syed Layak Ali

... Respondents



Crl.O.P.Nos.24293 of 2017 and 23381 of 2018

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C, to call for the records culminating in registering of FIR No.367 of 2017 dated 28.10.2017 on the file of CCB-1, C5hennai CCB and quash the same.

For Petitioners : Mr.Chinmoy Sharma, Senior Counsel
for Mr.A.R.Ramanathan
For R1 and R2 : Mr.L.Baskaran
Government Advocate (Crl.side)
For R3 : Mr.Vaibhav R.Venkatesh
assisted by Mr.Anirudh A.Sriram

Crl.O.P.No.23381 of 2018:-

Abhishek Ganguly,
Managing Director,
PUMA Sports India Private Limited,
No.509, CMH Road,
Indira Nagar,
Bengaluru-560038.

... Petitioner

-Vs-

1. The Deputy Commissioner of Police,
Central Crime Branch-2,
Commissioner Office Building,
EVK Sampath Road, Vepery,
Chennai-600007.

2. The Inspector of Police,
CCB-I,
Chennai CCB,
Old Commissionerate Building,
Pantheon Road, Egmore,
Chennai-600008.

3. Syed Layak Ali

... Respondents



Crl.O.P.Nos.24293 of 2017 and 23381 of 2018

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C, to call for the records culminating in registering of FIR No.369 of 2018 dated 30.08.2018 on the file of the second respondent, Chennai and quash the same.

For Petitioner : Mr.Chinmoy Sharma, Senior Counsel
for Mr.A.R.Ramanathan
For R1 and R2 : Mr.L.Baskaran
Government Advocate (Crl.side)
For R3 : Mr.Vaibhav R.Venkatesh
assisted by Mr.Anirudh A.Sriram

COMMON ORDER

The Crl.O.P.No.24293 of 2017 has been filed to quash the FIR in Crime No.367 of 2017 dated 28.10.2017 on the file of the second respondent.

2. The Crl.O.P.No.23381 of 2018 has been filed to quash the FIR in Crime No. 369 of 2018 dated 30.08.2018 on the file of the second respondent.

3. The third respondent lodged a complaint that he is a Chief Executive Officer of M/s. Quintessential Designs Pvt.Ltd and engaged in the business of designing, product development, prototyping and manufacturing of apparel with a specialization in bottom wears (Pants). They had service clients both overseas and in India. They had engaged with the accused for the purpose of being a “Full Service Vendor” in apparel, more specifically “Pants” to design, product develop, prototype and sales sample along with the formulation of the strategy



Crl.O.P.Nos.24293 of 2017 and 23381 of 2018

for Pricing and Positioning for the premium line of Sport Casual Pants, for

“Puma”, thereby they were requested to create 25 styles as prototypes for presentation, review and selection by the accused. They were to be compensated and rewarded through orders for such services which was initiated in the month of January, 2013. The ownership of copy right for all styles belongs to the complainant. After prices were agreed to and confirmed for both parts of the engagement by the accused, the complainant were commissioned to create ten styles, five of which were completely designed, product developed, prototyped and sales sampled by the complainant and five other styles were design translated, prototyped and sales sampled with the understanding that there would be no payment awarded by the accused for the services provided and the work carried out by the complainant. Instead, all orders received by the accused, generated by the subject samples would be placed before the complainant for execution as many years that had gone into the delivery of subject sales samples as prototypes executed by the complainant for the accused to be used for the booking of orders at “Puma Road Show” and with their trade and retail partners for the season Spring '14. However, there was no written contract with the accused. The complainant moved forward with both parts of engagement in trust and good faith in accused and its representatives had completed sales samples, totalling 32 numbers of garments were delivered to the accused, which



CrI.O.P.Nos.24293 of 2017 and 23381 of 2018

was acknowledged by them. The accused had advised and committed to complainant and booked orders against the subject samples solely with the complainant. Thereafter, they suddenly showed a change of heart and became non committal in their e-mail and telephonic communication evidencing their criminal intent in intentionally deceiving the complainant and exploit the opportunity to gain illegal monetary benefits. The accused deliberately deceived the complainant that due to the prices there could be no orders and thereafter, went on to place such orders received by the accused and generated by the subject samples with other vendors even though the prices and minimum orders were confirmed by the accused from the complainant. Even after receipt of receiving orders, against the subject sales samples of the complainant, the accused placed orders with other vendors, thus, intentionally deceived and deprived the complainant of their rightful benefits of receiving all orders to be compensated by way of investments both monetarily and otherwise. Therefore, the complainant requested to send back all samples immediately, as they were the rightful property of the complainant both intellectually and physically. They restricted the accused to use any of the designs of the subject samples or any part of the subject samples that were designed by the complainant. By the E-mail dated 13.08.2013, the accused refused to return the subject sales samples that rightfully belonged to the complainant and infringed the copyright of the



Crl.O.P.Nos.24293 of 2017 and 23381 of 2018

subject samples designed by the complainant. Thereafter, the accused used the subject samples as prototypes for the purpose of engineering, the manufacture of the subject ten styles with other vendors, thereby the accused not only misappropriated the physical samples but also misappropriated the very purpose of the subject sales samples itself. When the complainant purchased the said samples from Puma Stores in Chennai, found that it replicates of two of the ten styles bearing Puma branch label, which styles were part of the subject samples executed by the complainant for the accused, thereby the accused infringed on the copyright of the two of the ten styles whose ownership rests exclusively with the complainant. By another purchase, the complainant found that three of the five styles that had been “design translated”, product developed, prototyped and sales sampled from Puma's Tech packs for the “Puma Road Show” and proves the infringement on the copyright. The accused, further misappropriated the physical samples numbering 32, which were delivered to the accused by way of the delivery challan which was acknowledged by the accused. It reconfirmed the receipt of the same by an E-mail dated 18.06.2013. The accused misappropriated the subject sales samples meant for booking of orders and placing such orders with other vendors to monetarily and commercially gain unlawfully. All the accused colluded together to defraud and cheat the complainant, thereby caused loss through their acts. The accused had lured the



Crl.O.P.Nos.24293 of 2017 and 23381 of 2018

complainant into this engagement and to part with subject samples with the promise of orders for services rendered involving the efforts and investments of the complainant to benefit and enrich themselves monetarily while repositioning and elevating the lifestyle apparel line of Puma's Sport Casual Pants. They had enriched themselves greatly and unjustly by these acts and are guilty of criminal breach of trust, misappropriation of property, copyright infringement and cheating, thereby caused loss to the tune of Rs.2.50 Crores. Hence, the complaint.

4. On receipt of the complaint, the FIR was not registered and as such, the complainant was constrained to file a private complaint under Section 156(3) of Cr.P.C. Though the learned Magistrate directed to register the FIR under Section 156(3) of Cr.P.C, no FIR was registered. Therefore, once again, the complainant approached this Court in Crl.O.P.No.19374 of 2017. This Court, by an order dated 22.09.2017 directed the first respondent to register the FIR. As directed by this Court, the first respondent registered the FIR in Crime No.367 of 2017 for the offences punishable under Sections 63(a) and 51 of Copyright Act, 1957 and Section 406 of IPC.

5. In continuation of the first complaint registered in Crime No.367 of



CrI.O.P.Nos.24293 of 2017 and 23381 of 2018

2017, Crime No.369 of 2018 has been registered for the offences under Sections

63(a) and 51 of Copyright Act, 1957 as against two accused alleging the involvement of willful infringement of copyright of some or more of the balance 23 designs/styles. The order passed by this Court dated 23.06.2015, stating that the ownership of the Artistic Work of the 25 illustrations created and designed by the complainant for the first part of the engagement with the accused for the Road Show of Puma for the season Spring 14. The accused admitted before this Court that they had manufactured several items of the subject 23 designs/styles and also stated that by reason of the injunction order granted they were unable to market the products, suffered loss every day and resultantly stocks have accumulated. They had liquidated the stocks of the injuncted 23 designs/styles, that was admittedly manufactured by and in stock with them, thereby committed a willful infringement of copyright. Therefore, there is every possibility that the accused had sold the stocks to a “stock lot dealer”, liquidating the products of the infringed designs/ styles after removing the Puma branding. Therefore, the complainant would suffer a great injustice and be put to irreparable losses if the products with the infringed designs/ styles flood the market. Therefore, requested to prevent the accused from liquidating the accused and also from challenging the market. Hence, the complaint.



CrI.O.P.Nos.24293 of 2017 and 23381 of 2018

6. The learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners were looking to engage the service of manufacturers/service providers for manufacturing samples from designs developed by the company for Spring 2014. The complainant, being the service manufacturers, offered to develop samples. The petitioners had forwarded all the relevant documents including Puma code of conduct, testing requirements, quality submission and approval procedures, cost sheet format, guidelines and expectations from the supplies, accessory ad trim requirements, hangtag and sticker guideline, specsheets for both men and women, bottom styles, basic blocks of Puma, pattern documents, measurement guide, design sheets, sketches of apparels and various other relevant information for developing the sample product at part with Puma standards available in market. It were mailed by the complainant on 21.12.2012. Therefore, it was the ideas and concept of designs of the petitioners that have been put together by the complainant to develop the samples in question. The complainant had merely assembled the raw materials and design elements/concepts supplied by the petitioners and developed the designs in questions as conceptualized by the petitioners. Therefore, the complainant cannot claim to be the author/creator of the designs in question by any stretch of imagination.



CrI.O.P.Nos.24293 of 2017 and 23381 of 2018

7. The complainant filed a suit in C.S.No.215 of 2015 as against the petitioners seeking injunction in relation to 25 designs and also claimed compensation of Rs.2,58,49,215/-. This Court, by an order dated 23.06.2015, allowed the petitioners to continue to sell the products of two of the 25 designs which were the subject matter of the plaint and granted an interim injunction in respect of 23 designs. In respect of two designs, the complainant filed appeals and in respect of remaining designs, the petitioners filed appeal, in O.S.A.Nos.215 and 216 of 2015 and in O.S.A.Nos.235 to 237 of 2015 respectively. The Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court, disposed of the appeals, thereby directed to dispose of the suit and issued directions. However, the interim injunction granted by the learned Single Judge would remain in force, till the disposal of the suit. Thereafter, the present complaint was filed by the complainant. Therefore, the present impugned FIRs are pre-matured and it cannot be sustained. Only after the adjudication of the issues in the suit with regard to ownership of the copyright, any complaint can be entertained. Till the declaration of ownership, no criminal complaint can be sustained in respect of infringement of copyright which is allegedly claimed by the complainant. Further, with the very same set of allegations, the second FIR has been registered and it is also liable to be quashed. That apart, the first respondent had no jurisdiction to register any complaint, since the petitioners are located at



Crl.O.P.Nos.24293 of 2017 and 23381 of 2018

Bangalore. They engage service of the complainant and as such, the first respondent has no jurisdiction to register any complaint. In support of his contention, he relied upon various decisions of this Court as well as the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India.

8. Per contra, the learned counsel for the second respondent mainly relied upon the order passed by this Court in O.A.Nos.305 to 307 of 2015 dated 23.06.2015, thereby, this Court found prima facie case and granted injunction in respect of 23 designs/styles which were claimed by the complainant. Therefore, the petitioners infringed the copyright of the complainant and they are liable to be prosecuted. That apart, the FIR cannot be quashed on its threshold and it has to be investigated in depth to unearth the truth, since the complainant had made out a prima facie case and the learned Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore Chennai, ordered to register the FIR. Therefore, the FIR cannot be quashed on its threshold. The second FIR is nothing but the continuation of first FIR. The second FIR has been filed on the allegation that the accused were about to clear the stocks. Therefore, the first respondent had rightly registered the second FIR. In support of his contentions, he relied upon various judgments.



Crl.O.P.Nos.24293 of 2017 and 23381 of 2018

9. Heard the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioners, the learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) appearing for the respondents 1 and 2 and the learned counsel for the third respondent and perused the materials available on record.

10. The petitioners in Crl.O.P.No.24293 of 2017 are arrayed as A2 and A3 in Crime No.367 of 2017 registered for the offences under Sections 63(a) and 51 of Copyright Act, 1957 and Section 406 of IPC. The petitioner in Crl.O.P.No.23381 of 2018 is arrayed as A1 in Crime No.369 of 2018 registered for the offences under Sections 63(a) and 51 of Copyright Act, 1957.

11. Admittedly, the complainant is an apparel manufacturer with a specialization of bottom wears for both men and women. They are incorporated under the Companies Act. The petitioners are well known for marketing their products in their brand name “PUMA” in the field of Sports etc. The dispute between the parties is in receipt of claiming copyright for 25 styles of pants which were designed by the complainant. The styles/designs were product conceptualized, designed and product developed by the complainant. Therefore, they are the owner of the designs developed by them. The petitioners also claimed that only on their guidance and technical supports, the complainant developed the styles and as such, they cannot claim any ownership of the styles



CrI.O.P.Nos.24293 of 2017 and 23381 of 2018

developed by them. Admittedly, there was no agreement or deed in any form entered between them, while placing service of the complainant. There were E-mail communications between them in respect of 25 styles which were ordered to make designs. As offered by the petitioners, the complainant created 25 styles. They were engaged in the business of designs, product develop, prototyping and manufacturer of apparel with the specialization in bottom wears.

12. A perusal of the communication sent by the complainant also revealed that the designs created by them as a full service vendor. From the styles designed by the complainant, the accused marketed the products and they failed to give any order to the complainant for the reason that the cost is very high and the styles are more winterized. Therefore, the complainant had put the intellectual input for creation of the line and that they suffered great amount of money, time and effort, intellectual input and years of experience to bring about the line developed and handed over to the petitioners.

13. Therefore, the complainant filed a suit as against the accused in C.S.No.215 of 2015 before this Court for the following reliefs:-



WEB COPY

"It is, therefore, prayed that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to grant judgment and decree against the Defendant:-

(i) Permanent injunction restraining the Defendants whether by themselves, their promoters, employees, servants, agents, legal representatives or any one claiming through them from infringing or attempting to infringe the Copyright vested with the Plaintiffs, subsisting in style no. PMA1008LP product conceptualized, designed and product developed by the Plaintiffs for the Defendant No. 1 and exhibited during the Road Show for Season Spring '14 by manufacturing, causing to manufacture, marketing either directly or indirectly or in any manner dealing with the said style no. PMA1008LP in any manner whatsoever,

(ii) Permanent injunction restraining the Defendants whether by themselves, their promoters, employees, servants, agents, legal representatives or any one claiming through them from infringing or attempting to infringe the Copyright vested with the Plaintiffs, subsisting in style no. PMA1013LP product conceptualized, designed and Product developed by the Plaintiffs for the Defendant No. 1 and exhibited during the Road Show for Season Spring '14 by manufacturing, causing to manufacture, marketing either directly or indirectly or in any manner dealing with the said style no. PMA1013LP in any manner whatsoever;

(iii) Permanent injunction restraining the Defendants whether by themselves, their promoters, employees, servants, agents, legal representatives or any one claiming through them from in any manner infringing the Copyright vested with the Plaintiffs, subsisting in balance 23 of 25 designs more-fully mentioned in Schedule 1 hereunder, which were product conceptualized, designed and developed by the Plaintiffs for the Defendant No. 1 and presented to Defendant no 1 for the limited purpose of selection for the Road Show for Season Spring '14 by developing, manufacturing, marketing either directly or indirectly or dealing in any manner whatsoever,

(iv) An order directing the Defendants, their men, agents, successors in business, assigns, representatives or any other person or entity claiming through or under them to deliver up the 32 samples more-fully explained in the Schedule II hereunder



CrI.O.P.Nos.24293 of 2017 and 23381 of 2018

including copy/copies thereof and other copyright protected materials of the Plaintiffs in physical, mechanical or electronic form without making or retaining any copy/copies, alterations, reproductions or duplicates of the same in any form whatsoever;

(v) The defendants be ordered to pay to the plaintiffs a sum of Rs 2,58,49,215/- as liquidated damages;

(vi) An order for costs of the proceedings.

(vii) An order for rendition of accounts by the Defendants

(viii) An order for damages to be paid by the Defendants on account of infringement of copyright of the Plaintiffs' together with such interests thereon by reason of infringement of the Plaintiff's copyrights, including conversion damages which are presently indeterminate and a decree be passed against the Defendants in the sum of the amount so ascertained as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper to grant in the present facts and circumstances

(ix) Such other order or orders as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the light of the facts and circumstances of the present case and thereby render justice."

14. The complainant also filed applications for injunction in O.A.No.305 to 307 of 2015 in C.S.No.215 of 2015. This Court by a common order dated 23.06.2015 allowed the applications filed by the complainant. This Court observed as follows:-

" 25. A perusal of the above said definition shows that even a diagram, map, chart or plan, whether or not any such work possesses artistic quality, also comes within the meaning of the term 'artistic work'. Further, as per Section 2(c)(iii), any other work of artistic craftsmanship also comes under the definition of the term 'artistic work'. In any event, whether the said artistic work claimed by the plaintiffs, entitles for copyright or not, is a matter



Crl.O.P.Nos.24293 of 2017 and 23381 of 2018

for consideration while hearing the main suit, and therefore, at this stage, this Court is not inclined to go into the said question and decide the same. However, based on the definition given to the term 'artistic work' as discussed supra, this Court is of the view that the plaintiffs have made out a prima-facie case for claiming such a right."

15. Thus, it is clear that the complainant had made out a prima facie case to register the FIR for the offences under Sections 63(a) and 52 of the Copyright Act, 1957. As per Section 17 of the Copyright Act, 1957, the author of the work shall be the first owner of the copyright, therein provided that there must be an employer-employee relationship under a contract of service or apprenticeship. In this case, admittedly, no amount is agreed to be paid by the petitioners to the complainant for the work done by them, and therefore, there is no question of claiming that the principal and agent relationship exists between the parties. The work done by them for the complainant, is on a principal to principal basis and not as an employment.

16. This Court by a common order dated 23.06.2015 in O.A.Nos.305 to 307 of 2015 in C.S.No.215 of 2015 concluded as follows:-

"41. Learned Senior Counsel appearing for the defendants further relied on the decision of the Supreme Court reported in 1990 (Supp) SCC 727 (Wander Ltd. Vs. Antox India P. Ltd), to contend that the interlocutory injunction can be granted only at a stage when the existence of the legal right is



WEB COPY

asserted by the plaintiffs. Paragraph 9 of the said decision reads as follows:

"9. Usually, the prayer for grant of an interlocutory injunction is at a stage when the existence of the legal right asserted by the plaintiffs and its alleged violation are both contested and uncertain and remain uncertain till they are established at the trial on evidence. The Court, at this stage, acts on certain well settled principles of administration of this form of interlocutory remedy which is both temporary and discretionary. The object of the interlocutory injunction, it is stated " is to protect the plaintiff against injury by violation of his rights for which he could not adequately be compensated in damages recoverable in the action if the uncertainty were resolved in his favour at the trial. The need for such protection must be weighed against the corresponding need of the defendant to be protected against injury resulting from his having been prevented from exercising his own legal rights for which he could not be adequately compensated. The Court must weigh one need against another and determine where the 'balance of convenience' lies."

The interlocutory remedy is intended to preserve in status quo, the rights of parties which may appear on a prima facie case. The Court also, in restraining a defendant from exercising what he considers his legal right but what the plaintiff would like to be prevented, puts into the scales, as a relevant consideration whether the defendant has yet to commence his enterprise or whether he has already been doing so in which latter case considerations somewhat different from those that apply to a case where the defendant is yet to commence his enterprise, are attracted."

42. I do not think that the above decision helps the defendants in any manner, especially when this Court has found that the plaintiffs have a strong case based on the given facts and circumstances.

43. Considering all the above stated facts and circumstances, I am of the view that the applicants/plaintiffs are



Crl.O.P.Nos.24293 of 2017 and 23381 of 2018

entitled for grant of interim injunction insofar 23 styles are concerned, as has been granted by this Court in O.A.No.307 of 2015, since admittedly, the respondents/defendants have not marketed those 23 styles. Further, I am of the view that the balance of convenience is also in favour of the applicants/plaintiffs for grant of such interim injunction, otherwise, the applicants/plaintiffs would be put to irreparable injury.

44. Accordingly, the interim order of injunction already granted in O.A.No.307 of 2015 is made absolute and consequently, O.A.No.307 of 2015 is allowed and Application No.2890 of 2015 filed for vacating the said interim injunction, is dismissed.

45. Insofar as the other two applications in O.A.Nos.305 and 306 of 2015 are concerned, in view of the fact that already two designs/styles which are the subject matter of those two applications, have already been marketed even before filing the above suit, no purpose would be served by granting the interim injunction as sought for in those two applications during the pendency of the suit. However, in order to protect the interest of the applicants/plaintiffs, the respondents/defendants are directed to render accounts of such sale of those two styles, namely PMA 1008 LP and PMA 1013 LP, to this Court at the time of trial, so that a just and proper decision could be arrived at in the main suit. Accordingly, O.A.Nos.305 and 306 of 2015 are disposed of in the above terms.”

17. Aggrieved by the same, the complainant as well as the petitioners preferred appeals in O.S.A.Nos.215, 216, 235 to 237 of 2015. The Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court, on 18.02.2016, disposed of the appeals with directions. However, the interim order passed by the learned Single Judge of this Court would remain in force, till the decision of the post Trial.



Crl.O.P.Nos.24293 of 2017 and 23381 of 2018

WEB COPY

18. Therefore, the complainant had made a prima facie case to register the FIR in Crime Nos.367 of 2017 and 369 of 2018. A perusal of the entire FIR as stated above, there are materials to attract the offences under Sections 63(a) and 51 of Copyright Act, 1957 and Section 406 of IPC.

19. Therefore, the FIR is not an encyclopedia and it need not contain all facts and it cannot be quashed in its threshold. This Court finds that the FIR discloses prima facie commission of cognizable offence and as such this Court cannot interfere with the investigation. The investigating machinery has to step in to investigate, grab and unearth the crime in accordance with the procedures prescribed in the Code.

20. It is relevant to rely upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India passed in ***Crl.A.No.255 of 2019*** dated ***12.02.2019*** in the case of ***Sau.***

Kamal Shivaji Pokarnekhar vs. the State of Maharashtra & ors., as follows:-

"4. The only point that arises for our consideration in this case is whether the High Court was right in setting aside the order by which process was issued. It is settled law that the Magistrate, at the stage of taking cognizance and summoning,



WEB COPY

is required to apply his judicial mind only with a view to taking cognizance of the offence, or in other words, to find out whether a prima facie case has been made out for summoning the accused persons. The learned Magistrate is not required to evaluate the merits of the material or evidence in support of the complaint, because the Magistrate must not undertake the exercise to find out whether the materials would lead to a conviction or not.

5. Quashing the criminal proceedings is called for only in a case where the complaint does not disclose any offence, or is frivolous, vexatious, or oppressive. If the allegations set out in the complaint do not constitute the offence of which cognizance has been taken by the Magistrate, it is open to the High Court to quash the same. It is not necessary that a meticulous analysis of the case should be done before the Trial to find out whether the case would end in conviction or acquittal. If it appears on a reading of the complaint and consideration of the allegations therein, in the light of the statement made on oath that the ingredients of the offence are disclosed, there would be no justification for the High Court to interfere.

.....

9. Having heard the learned Senior Counsel and examined the material on record, we are of the considered view that the High Court ought not to have set aside the order passed



CrI.O.P.Nos.24293 of 2017 and 23381 of 2018

by the Trial Court issuing summons to the Respondents. A perusal of the complaint discloses that prima facie, offences that are alleged against the Respondents. The correctness or otherwise of the said allegations has to be decided only in the Trial. At the initial stage of issuance of process it is not open to the Courts to stifle the proceedings by entering into the merits of the contentions made on behalf of the accused. Criminal complaints cannot be quashed only on the ground that the allegations made therein appear to be of a civil nature. If the ingredients of the offence alleged against the accused are prima facie made out in the complaint, the criminal proceeding shall not be interdicted."

21. In view of the above discussion, this Court is not inclined to quash the First Information Reports in Crime Nos.367 of 2017 and 369 of 2018 on the file of the CCB I, Chennai. However, the second respondent is directed to complete the investigation in Crime Nos.367 of 2017 and 369 of 2018 and file a final report, within a period of twelve weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

22. Accordingly, these Criminal Original Petitions are dismissed. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petitions are closed.



Crl.O.P.Nos.24293 of 2017 and 23381 of 2018

23.11.2023

WEB COPY

Internet: Yes

Index : Yes/No

Speaking/Non Speaking order

mn

To

1. The Deputy Commissioner of Police,
Central Crime Branch-2,
Commissioner Office Building,
EVK Sampath Road, Vepery,
Chennai-600007.

2. The Inspector of Police,



Crl.O.P.Nos.24293 of 2017 and 23381 of 2018

CCB-I,
Chennai CCB,
Old Commissionerate Building,
Pantheon Road, Egmore,
Chennai-600008.

3. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN. J,

mn

Crl.O.P.Nos.24293 of 2017 and 23381 of 2018



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.Nos.24293 of 2017 and 23381 of 2018

and

Crl.M.P.Nos.18072, 18073, 18076 and 18077 of 2019

23.11.2023