

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 02.04.2019

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN

W.P.No.7372 of 2019
and
W.M.P.Nos.8058 & 8059 of 2019

M.Gopal

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Superintendant of Police,
Salem District,
Salem.

2. The Inspector of Police,
Mettur Police Station,
Mettur, Salem District.

3. The Sub Inspector of Police,
Mettur Police Station,
Mettur, Salem District.

... Respondents

Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the records in FIR.No.9 of 2019 dated 16.01.2019 on the file of second respondent and quash the same and direct the second respondent to register FIR as per the complaint given by the petitioner in writing on 25.01.2019.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Rajarajan

For Respondents : Mr.M.Mohamed Riyaz
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

This Writ Petition has been filed seeking to quash the FIR.No.9 of 2019 dated 16.01.2019 on the file of the second respondent and direct the second respondent to register FIR as per the complaint given by the petitioner in writing on 25.01.2019.

2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is an innocent person and he has not

committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. Without any base, the second respondent police registered a case in Crime No.9 of 2019 for the offences under Sections 279, 304 (A) IPC, as against the petitioner. Hence, he prayed to quash the same.

3. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor would submit that the investigation is almost completed and the respondent police have only to file final report.

4. Heard Mr.R.Rajaram, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and Mr.M.Mohamed Riyaz, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.

5. It is seen from the First Information Report that there is a specific allegation as against the petitioner, which has to be investigated. Further the FIR is not an encyclopedia and it need not contain all facts. Further, it cannot be quashed in the 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 into investigate, grab and unearth the crime in accordance with the procedures prescribed in the Code.

6. Further, in the case of *Sau. Kamal Shivaji Pokarnekar vs. the State of Maharashtra & ors.* in CrI.A.No.255 of 2019 dated 12.02.2019, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India has held 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, 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 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."

7. In view of the above discussion, this Court is not inclined to quash the FIR.No.9 of 2019 as against the petitioner. Hence, the second respondent is directed to complete the investigation in Crime No.9 of 2019 and file a final report within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, before the jurisdiction Magistrate, if not already filed.

8. With the above directions, this Writ Petition is dismissed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar (CS-VIII)

//True copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

raja

To

1. The Superintendant of Police,
Salem District,
Salem.
2. The Inspector of Police,
Mettur Police Station,
Mettur, Salem District.
3. The Sub Inspector of Police,
Mettur Police Station,
Mettur, Salem District.
4. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

+1cc to Mr.R.Rajarajan, Advocate SR.No.31742

W.P.No.7372 of 2019
and

W.M.P.Nos.8058 & 8059 of 2019

VBA (CO)
GMY (22/05/2019)

WEB COPY