



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENGH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 13.09.2019

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN

CRL.O.P (MD) No. 1070 of 2019

and

Crl.M.P. (MD) No. 467 of 2019

Abupakkar Sithik

... Petitioner/A4

Vs

1. The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Keelakarai,
Ramanathapuram District.

2. Senthil Murugan
Sub-Inspector of Police,
Keelakarai Police Station.

3. The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
National Investigation Agency,
Camp at Ramanathapuram,
Ramanathapuram

... Respondents

(3rd respondent is impleaded by order of this Court, dated 13.09.2019 in Crl.MP.(MD) No.6333 of 2019 in Crl OP(MD) No.1070/2019)

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C, praying to call for the records pertaining to the crime No. 46 of 2018 on the file of the first respondent police and quash the same.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.M.A. Jinnah

For Respondent : Mr.R. Karthikeyan, for
No.3 Spl. Public Prosecutor NIA

O R D E R

This petition has been filed to quash the proceedings in crime No. 46 of 2018 on the file of the first respondent police as against the petitioner.



2. The learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is innocent person and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. Without any base, the first respondent police registered a case in Crime No. 46 of 2018 for the offences under Sections 153A, 120B of I.P.C. and Section 15, 17, 18, 19, 20 & 25(1)(a) of Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967 as against the petitioner. He further would submit that the other accused/A1, A2, A3, A7 & A8 filed quash petition before this Court in Crl. O.P.(MD) No.22640 of 2018 the same was dismissed on 21.12.2018. Hence he prayed to quash the same.

3. The learned Special Public Prosecutor appearing for the third respondent would submit that the investigation of this case has been handed over to the third respondent the same is still pending and this petition is in premature stage and hence, he prayed for dismissal of this petition.

4. Heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.

5. It is seen from the First Information Report that now the investigation of this case has been handed over to the third respondent and that there are 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 in to investigate, grab and unearth the crime in accordance with the procedures prescribed in the Code.

6. It is also relevant to rely upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India passed in **Crl.A.No.255 of 2019** dated **12.02.2019 - Sau. Kamal Shivaji Pokarnekar vs. the State of Maharashtra & ors.**, 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



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.

6.....

7.....

8.....

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, this Court is not inclined to quash the FIR. Accordingly, this criminal original petition is dismissed. No costs. However, the third respondent police is



directed to complete the investigation and file final report, within a period of Three (3) months, from the date of receipt of copy of this Order, before the jurisdiction Magistrate.

WEB COPY

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CS-II)

// True Copy //

Sub Assistant Registrar (CS)

ksa

To

1. The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Keelakarai,
Ramanathapuram District.
2. Senthil Murugan
Sub-Inspector of Police,
Keelakarai Police Station.
3. The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
National Investigation Agency,
Camp at Ramanathapuram.
4. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

+1 CC to M/s.S.M.A.JINNAH, Advocate (SR-86666[F] dated 13/09/2019)

+1 CC to M/s.R. KARTHIKEYAN, Advocate (SR-86780[F] dated 16/09/2019)

Order made in
CRL.O.P (MD) No. 1070 of 2019
13.09.2019

_KM/ (17.10.2019) 4P 7C