



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 25.11.2019

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.1542 of 2019

and

Crl.M.P.(MD)Nos.794 and 795 of 2019

1.A.Edmund

2.Joiys

... Petitioners/Accused 1&2

-Vs-

1.The Inspector of Police,
Thoothukudi Central Police Station,
Thoothukudi District.
(Crime No.304 of 2014)

... 1st Respondent/Complainant

2.Sivananantha Perumal

... 2nd Respondent/Defacto Complainant

Prayer: Criminal Original petition filed under Section 482 of Code of Criminal Procedure, to call for the records pertaining to the proceedings in C.C.No.242 of 2016 under Section 420 of IPC pending trial on the file of the Judicial Magistrate No.II, Thoothukudi and quash the same.

For Petitioners	: Mr.R.Aravind Raj
For R1	: Mr.K.Suyambulinga Bharathi Government Advocate(Crl.side)
For R2	: Mr.C.T.Perumal

O R D E R

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed to quash the proceedings in C.C.No.242 of 2016, pending on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Thoothukudi.

2.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners are innocent persons and they have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution.

3.The learned Government Advocate (criminal side) submitted that there are materials available to proceed with the case as against the petitioners herein and at the threshold, the criminal proceedings cannot be quashed and the charges framed against the petitioners have to be gone into a full-fledged trial. Hence, he prayed for dismissal of the petition.



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

5. A careful perusal of entire materials available on record, the final report discloses a *prima facie* offence against the petitioners and there is no reason to interfere with the same. It is also relevant to rely upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India passed in **Crl.A.No.579 of 2019** dated **02.04.2019** in the case of **Devendra Prasad Singh Vs. State of Bihar & Anr.**, as follows:-

" 12. So far as the second ground is concerned, we are of the view that the High Court while hearing the application under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. had no jurisdiction to appreciate the statement of the witnesses and record a finding that there were inconsistencies in their statements and, therefore, there was no *prima facie* case made out against respondent No.2. In our view, this could be done only in the trial while deciding the issues on the merits or/and by the Appellate Court while deciding the appeal arising out of the final order passed by the Trial Court but not in Section 482 Cr.P.C. proceedings.

13. In view of the foregoing discussion, we allow the appeal, set aside the impugned order and restore the aforementioned complaint case to its original file for being proceeded with on merits in accordance with law.

6. Recently, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India held in respect of the very same issue in **Crl.A.No.1572 of 2019 - Central Bureau of Investigation Vs. Arvind Khanna**, wherein, it has been held as follows:

"19. After perusing the impugned order and on hearing the submissions made by the learned senior counsels on both sides, we are of the view that the impugned order passed by the High Court is not sustainable. In a petition filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C., the High Court has recorded findings on several disputed facts and allowed the petition. Defence of the accused is to be tested after appreciating the evidence during trial. The very fact that the High Court, in this case, went into the most minute details, on the allegations made by the appellant-C.B.I., and the defence put-forth by the respondent, led us to a conclusion that the High Court



has exceeded its power, while exercising its inherent jurisdiction under Section 482 Cr.P.C.

20. In our view, the assessment made by the High Court at this stage, when the matter has been taken cognizance by the Competent Court, is completely incorrect and uncalled for."

The above judgments are squarely applicable to this case and as such, the points raised by the petitioners cannot be considered by this Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C.

7. In view of the above discussions, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are also dismissed.

8. At this juncture, the learned Counsel for the petitioners submitted that the presence of the petitioners before the Trial Court may be dispensed with.

9. Accepting the said submission, the personal appearance of the petitioners is dispensed with and they shall be represented by a counsel after filing appropriate application. The petitioners shall be present before the Court at the time of furnishing of copies, framing charges, questioning under Section 313 Cr.P.C. and at the time of passing judgment.

10. The learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Thoothukudi, is directed to complete the proceedings, within a period of six months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CS-III)

// True Copy //

Sub Assistant Registrar (CS)

das

To

1. The Judicial Magistrate No.II,
Thoothukudi.

2. The Inspector of Police,
Thoothukudi Central Police Station,
Thoothukudi District.



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

+1 CC to MR.R. ARAVIND RAJ, Advocate (SR-101056[F] dated
25/11/2019)

+1 CC to MR.C.T. PERUMAL, Advocate (SR-101473[F] dated 26/11/2019)

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.1542 of 2019

and

Crl.M.P.(MD)Nos.794 and 795 of 2019

25.11.2019

MK (16.12.2019) 4P 6C