

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE T.SUNIL CHOWDARY

CRIMINAL PETITION No.2672 of 2016

ORDER:

_____ This petition is filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. to quash the proceedings against the petitioners/accused No.2, 3, 7 and 8 in Crime No.69 of 2016 on the file of Station House Officer, Malkajgiri Police Station, Ranga Reddy District, registered under Sections 420, 346, 406, 418, 471, 120-B and 506 IPC.

2. _____ Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned Public Prosecutor representing the State.

3. A perusal of the record reveals that the petitioners are accused Nos.2, 3, 7 and 8 and the 1st respondent is the *de facto* complainant in Crime No.69 of 2016. As per the allegations made in the complaint, the Accused No.1 wrongfully confined the first respondent and obtained sale deeds in the name of Accused Nos.7 and 8. It is further alleged that the accused No.1 had withdrawn the money from the bank account of the first respondent without his knowledge. The gist of the allegations made in the complaint is that the petitioners herein cheated the 1st respondent and misappropriated the money.

4. The contention of learned counsel for the petitioners is that the 1st respondent foisted a false case against the petitioners with an ulterior moto. Whether the petitioners have committed the alleged offences or not will come to light during the course of investigation only. If this Court expresses any opinion touching the merits of the main case, the same may cause prejudice to one of the parties to the proceedings.

5. It is needless to say that the Court has to take into consideration the allegations made in the complaint while exercising

inherent jurisdiction under Section 482 Cr.P.C., in order to quash the criminal proceedings at the initial stage of investigation. The court is not justified in embarking upon an enquiry to ascertain the truthfulness, genuineness or otherwise of the allegations made in the complaint. It is a settled principle of law that the inherent power should not be exercised to stifle a legitimate investigation. If the allegations made in the complaint do not constitute the offence much less the offence alleged to have been committed by the petitioners, then this court can quash the proceedings in order to prevent abuse of process of Court thereby to secure the ends of justice.

6. I have carefully perused the material available on record in order to ascertain whether the allegations made in the complaint are patently absurd and inherently improbable thereby to quash the proceedings. The material available on record is *prima facie* sufficient to investigate into the matter in order to ascertain the truthfulness or otherwise of the allegations made in the complaint.

7. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case and also the principle enunciated in **R.P.Kapoor v. State of Punjab**^[1], **State of Haryana v. Bhajan Lal**^[2], **V.Y.Jose v. State of Gujarat**^[3] and **Teeja Devi v. State of Rajasthan**^[4], I am of the considered view that this is not a fit case to quash the criminal proceedings at the threshold.

8. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the concerned Station House Officer may be directed not to arrest the petitioners till completion of investigation.

9. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, the Station House Officer, Malkajgiri Police Station, Ranga Reddy District, is hereby directed not to arrest the petitioners/accused Nos.2, 3, 7 and 8 in Crime No.69 of 2016 till completion of investigation.

10. With the above direction, the Criminal Petition is dismissed. Consequently, Miscellaneous Petitions, if any, pending in this Criminal Petition shall stand closed.

T.SUNIL CHOWDARY, J

March 02, 2016.

Rds

[\[1\]](#) AIR 1960 SC 866

[\[2\]](#) AIR 1992 SC 604

[\[3\]](#) (2009) 3 SCC 78

[\[4\]](#) 2015 (1) ACR 564 (SC)