

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE T. SUNIL CHOWDARY

Criminal Revision Case No.68 of 2017

JUDGMENT:

This criminal revision case is filed under Sections 397 and 401 of Cr.P.C., challenging the order dated 11.11.2016 passed in M.C.No.37 of 2016 by the Executive Magistrate, Kadiyam.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the respondent (AP).

3. On 11.11.2016, the Executive Magistrate, Kadiyam, passed the following order.

“Whereas on the date of 12.02.2016, you have entered into a bond with self () sureties for your good behavior before this court on 12.02.2016 for a period of (1) years and in your default therein to forfeit to the Government a sum of Rs.1,00,000/-.

Whereas, Station House Officer, Prohibition and Excise Station, Rajamahendravaram South, vide reference 7th cited reported that you have committed an offence and thereby you have breached the bond that you entered into before this court. Whereas, a notice for enquiry was served upon you vide reference 8th cited calling for to prove to the satisfaction of this court that you have/ have not breached the bond you have executed before this court.

Whereas, the above enquiry held on 10.11.16 proved to the satisfaction of this court that you have breached the bond you have executed before this court.

Hence, you are hereby required to pay the said penalty of Rs.1,00,000/- i.e., the amount of bond you bound yourself before this court for good behavior or show a cause within (10) days as to why you should not be adjudged for imprisonment until the expiry of the bond period.”

4. A perusal of the record clearly reveals that the learned Executive Magistrate directed the petitioner to pay penalty of Rs.1,00,000/-. It is settled law that no quasi or judicial order can be passed without affording

reasonable opportunity to the affected party. Passing of any order without giving reasonable opportunity to the affected party would amount to violation of principles of natural justice. Admittedly, in the instant case, the order is being passed by the Executive Magistrate, without giving any opportunity to the petitioner leave apart non-following of the procedure contemplated under the Code of Criminal Procedure. If the order is allowed to stand, it would amount to miscarriage of justice. If there is any illegality or irregularity or impropriety in the orders passed by the lower authority, this court can set aside the same by exercising the revisional jurisdiction under Section 397 Cr.P.C.

5. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, the impugned order dated 11.11.2016 passed in M.C.No.37 of 2016, is set aside and the learned Executive Magistrate is hereby directed to pass appropriate orders in accordance with law, after affording reasonable opportunity to the petitioner.

6. The criminal revision case is, accordingly, allowed. Miscellaneous petitions, if any pending in this case, shall stand closed.

T. SUNIL CHOWDARY, J

Date: 06.01.2017
BSS

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE T. SUNIL CHOWDARY

35

Criminal Revision Case No.68 of 2017



Date: 06.01.2017

BSS