



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 01.11.2018

C O R A M

WEB COPY

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN

Crl.O.P. (MD)No.19947 of 2018

and

Crl.M.P. (MD)Nos.9145 and 9146 of 2018

Suresh Singh

...Petitioner

Vs.

1. The State represented by
The Inspector of Police,
Uvari Police Station,
Thirunelveli District.
(Crime No.87 of 2002)

2. A.Vijayakumar,
Sub-Inspector of Police,
Uvari Police Station,
Thirunelveli District.

...Respondents


Prayer: This Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, to call for the records relating to the case in S.C.No.163 of 2016 on the file of the learned Assistant Sessions Court, Valliyoor, Thirunelveli District and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner.

For Petitioner : Mr.K.Rajeshwaran
For R-1 : Mr.K.Suyambulinga Bharathi
Government Advocate, (Crl. Side)

ORDER

This petition has been filed to quash the case in S.C.No.163 of 2016 on the file of the learned Assistant Sessions Court, Valliyoor, Thirunelveli District, for the offences under Sections 147, 294(b), 353 r/w 149, 307 r/w 149 and 506(ii) IPC as against the petitioner herein.

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 08.10.2002, at about 10.00 p.m., the petitioner and other accused unlawfully gathered in front of the Bharathar Uvari Matha Kovil and the accused 1 to 5 were assembled with deadly weapons and abused the defacto complainant in filthy language and the first accused attempted to attack to the defacto complainant with Aruval, however he escaped. Thereby, the petitioner and other accused



prevented the defacto complainant with discharging his official duty. Hence, the complaint. After investigation, a charge sheet has been laid as against 14 accused persons, in which the petitioner arrayed as 6th accused. Since the some of the accused persons were not appeared, the case in respect of A6 was split up and renumbered and taken on file in S.C.No.163 of 2016 and committed to the learned Assistant Sessions Court, Valliyoor, Thirunelveli District.

3.The prosecution examined P.W.1 to P.W.9 and marked Ex.P.1 to Ex.P.5 to substantiate the charges against the accused persons.

4.On completion of the trial, the trial Court was pleased to acquit the accused persons. The prosecution witnesses P.W.1 and P.W.2 turned hostile. No one has spoken about the cognizance and there is absolutely no evidence as against the accused persons. When other accused persons were acquitted by the trial Court, the petitioner also shall have the same benefit under the order of acquittal. Therefore, he sought for quashing the criminal proceedings.

5. Per contra, the learned Government Advocate would submit that co-accused persons were acquitted in S.C.No.361 of 2007 by an order dated 26.10.2016 by the trial Court. The petitioner is standing on different footing and without taking the trial, he cannot be given the benefit of doubt. Further he would submit that the petitioner absconded and as such, the case has been split up and trial commenced in respect of the other accused. Therefore, he prayed for dismissal of this petition.

6. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned Government Advocate appearing for the first respondent.

7. A perusal of the records reveals that the petitioner arrayed as the sixth accused and he did not appear before the committal Court. Therefore, the case in respect of A6 was split up and renumbered and taken on file in S.C.No.163 of 2016 and committed to the learned Assistant Sessions Court, Valliyoor, Thirunelveli District and pending committal, the accused persons A1 and A2 died. Therefore, the trial commenced as against the other accused in S.C.No.361 of 2007 and case was ended in acquittal by an order dated 26.10.2016. The trial Court acquitted the accused on the ground that the prosecution examined P.W.1 to P.W.9, in which, P.W.1 and P.W.2 did not support the case of the prosecution and turned hostile. As such, there is no evidence to connect charges against the other accused. Therefore, the trial Court acquitted them. The petitioner is being the sixth accused, he is also entitled to get the same benefits.



8. In this regard, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner relied upon the judgment of this Court reported in **2008 (2) CTC 153** in the case of **Thamilendi vs. State by Inspector of Police, Orathanadu Police Station, Thanjavur District**. The paragraphs Nos.6 and 7 are extracted hereunder:

WEB COPY

"6. The learned counsel for the petitioner placed reliance on a decision of this Court in *Tamilmaran v. State*, 2007 (1) LW (CrI.) 514, to the proposition that in the event of acquittal of the other accused disbelieving the entire prosecution case, no useful purpose would be served for putting the petitioner to undergo ordeal of trial. In that decision, this Court placed reliance on a decision of Delhi High Court in *Sunil Kumar v. State*, 2000 (1) Crimes 73, wherein it is held as follows:

"3. The question thus is as to whether in the face of the judgment of acquittal the petitioner should still be permitted to under the ordeal of a trial. In *Sat Kumar v. State of Haryana*, AIR 1974 SC 294, it was held that there is no rule of law that if the Court acquits some of the accused on the evidence of a witness raising doubt with regard to them the other accused against whom there is absolute certainty about his complicity in the crime based on the remaining credible part of the evidence of that witness must be acquitted. (See also *Har Prasad v. State of Madhya Pradesh*, AIR 1971 SC 1450; *Makan Jivan v. State of Gujarat*, AIR 1971 SC 1797; *Mohd. Moin Uddin v. State of Maharashtra*, 1971 SCC (Cri.) 617). But where the evidence against all the accused persons is inseparable and indivisible and if some of the accused persons cannot be treated differently on the basis of the same evidence.

4. On perusal of the judgment of acquittal dated 19.1.1998, it appears that the deceased-Balwan Singh met with a homicidal death owing to burn injuries sustained by him has not been disputed by the accused persons. The evidence against the accused persons mainly consists of the evidence of the eye-witnesses, namely, Karan Singh (PW2) and Smt. Asha Rani (PW-5) (Wife of the deceased Balwan Singh) besides the dying



WEB COPY

declaration (Ex.PW-13-A) of the deceased Balwan Singh. Both the said witnesses have not supported the prosecution case and so they have been declared hostile by the prosecution. Eliminating the evidence of the said eye-witnesses, there remains the dying declaration (Ex.PW.13/A) of the deceased Balwan Singh, which has been disbelieved by the learned Additional Sessions Judge. It would, therefore, appear that the accused persons, namely, Jangli Tyagi were acquitted on the ground of insufficiency of evidence. Thus, the evidence adduced in the case against all the accused persons is inseparable and indivisible and that being so the petitioner cannot be treated differently on the basis of the said evidence. In this view of the matter, there is no prospect of the case ending in conviction against the petitioner and the valuable time of the Court would be wasted for holding trial only for the purpose of formally completing the procedure to pronounce the conclusion on a future date. If the Court is almost certain that the trial only would be an exercise in futility or sheer wastage of time, it is advisable to truncate or ship the proceedings at the stage of Section 227 of the Code itself."

7. This Court has also placed reliance on yet another decision of the Karnataka High Court in **Mohammed Ilias v. State of Karnataka**, 2001 (4) Crimes 417, taking the same view by following the decision rendered by the Delhi High Court [**Tamilmaran v. State**, 2007 (1) LW (Cr1.) 514]."

9. The above said principles laid down in the decision cited supra of this Court clearly applied to the case on hand. Therefore, this Court is of the considered view that the above said principles of law laid down in the decision cited supra are clearly applicable to the benefits of the instant case and all the accused persons were acquitted holding that the prosecution failed to prove the charges. Therefore, no useful purpose will be served by putting the petitioner to undergo ordeal of trial and as such, the criminal proceedings pending against the petitioner in S.C.No.163 of 2016 on the file of the Assistant Sessions Court, Vailankanni, Tirunelveli District is quashed.



10. Accordingly, this criminal original petition is allowed. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petitions are closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (AD-I)

WEB COPY/True Copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar (CS-I)

To

1. The Assistant Sessions Court, Valliyoor,
Thirunelveli District.

2. The Inspector of Police,
Uvari Police Station,
Thirunelveli District.

3. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

+1cc to Mr.K.Rajeshwaran, Advocate Sr.No.94402

SM

VB/SKN/SAR1/04.12.2018/5P/5C

Cr1.O.P (MD) No.19947 of 2018
01.11.2018