

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P.UBAID

FRIDAY, THE 6TH DAY OF MARCH 2015/15TH PHALGUNA, 1936

Crl.MC.No. 1411 of 2015 ()

AGAINST ST 1511/2012 of J.M.F.C.,TIRUR

PETITIONER(S)/3RD PARTY:

VIJAYALAKSHMI RANGANATH
W/O.L.N.RANGANATH, 19/577, KEERTHI NAGAR
RAMANILAYAM, CHALAPPURAM (PO), PIN 673002
CALICUT.

BY ADV. SRI.JAMSHEED HAFIZ

RESPONDENT(S)/DEFACTO COMPLAINANT:

-
1. THE STATE OF KERALA
REPRESENTED BY THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT OF KERALA, PIN 682031.
 2. THE FOOD INSPECTOR
MOBILE VIGILANCE SQUAD, KOZHIKODE
THROUGH FOOD INSPECTOR TIRUR MUNICIPALITY
TIRUR (PO), PIN 676101, MALAPPURAM DISTRICT.

R1 & R2 BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR SMT.SAREENA GEORGE.P

THIS CRIMINAL MISC. CASE HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON
06-03-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

Crl.MC.No. 1411 of 2015 ()

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S)' EXHIBITS

ANNEXURE-1: A TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT IN CRL.M.C.3173/2010 DATED 05.08.2010.

ANNEXURE-2: A TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT IN CRL.M.C.1995/2010 DATED 24.02.2010.

ANNEXURE-3: A TRUE COPY OF THE NOTICE ISSUED TO THE PETITIONER DATED 14.10.2014.

RESPONDENT(S)' EXHIBITS

/TRUE COPY/

P.S TO JUDGE

P.UBAID, J.
~~~~~  
**Crl.M.C No.1411 of 2015**  
~~~~~  
Dated this the 6th March 2015

ORDER

The petitioner herein seeks orders with respect to S.T No.1511 of 2012 of the Judicial First Class Magistrate's Court, Tirur, wherein, prosecution against the main accused stands quashed by this Court. It was a prosecution brought by the Food Inspector under the Prevention of Food Adulteration Act against a firm, and individually against the partners. The prosecution against the individual partners stands quashed now, but the prosecution still continues against the firm. The petitioner herein is only the landlady of the premises occupied by the firm. Her apprehension is that in view of the continuing prosecution against the firm, her property will be proceeded against. In view of such an apprehension as a third party, she seeks orders from this Court under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. It is not known what orders she can seek under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure in such a proceeding. It is also not known how she is aggrieved, and why she should

apprehend such consequences. She has only let out her premises to the firm for some business purposes. The said property is not the asset of the firm. The petitioner has nothing to worry regarding her property so long as it is not the asset of the firm, and it belongs to her exclusively. I do not think that any authority will proceed against the petitioner's property. In such a circumstance, this petition need not be entertained. With the above observations, this Crl.M.C can be closed. Accordingly, this Crl.M.C is closed, without being admitted to files.

**Sd/-
P.UBAID
JUDGE**

ma

/True copy/

P.S to Judge