



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 08.11.2019

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.6640 of 2019

and

Cr.M.P.(MD)Nos.4452 and 4453 of 2019

1.Syed Mahaboob Basha

2.Johny Begum

3.Syed Ghouse Moideen

4.Suriya Begum

5.Ibrahim @ Raja

... Petitioners/Accused 2 to 6

Vs.

1. The State Rep by its

The Inspector of Police,

All Women Police Station,

Thirupparankundram, Madurai City.

(Crime No.83 of 2013)

... Respondent/ Complainant

2. Sulthana Riswana

... Respondent / Defacto Complainant

**Prayer:** Criminal Original Petition filed under section 482 of Criminal Procedure Code, to call for the records pertaining to the C.C.No.142 of 2018, pending on the file of the learned Additional Mahila Judge, Madurai and quash the proceedings as against the petitioners.

For Petitioners

: Mr.AK.Azagarsami

For R1

: Mr.K.Suyambulinga Bharathi  
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

### **O R D E R**

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed to quash the proceedings in C.C.No.142 of 2018, pending on the file of the learned Additional Mahila Judge, Madurai, as against the petitioners.

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. Without any base, the first respondent police registered a case in Crime No.83 of 2013 for the offences punishable under Sections 498(A), 417, 406, 494 of IPC, as against the petitioners. The learned Additional Mahila Court has taken cognizance in C.C.No.142 of 2018, thereafter and the same was altered under Section 498(A) of IPC. Hence he prayed to quash the same.



3. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) would submit that some of the witnesses have been examined in this case.

4. Heard Mr.AK.Azagarsami, learned counsel appearing for the petitioners and Mr.K.Suyambulinga Bharathi, learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the first respondent.

5.It is 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."

WEB COPY

- The above judgment is squarely application 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 discussion, this Court is not inclined to quash the proceedings in C.C.No.142 of 2018 pending on the file of the learned Additional Mahila Court, Madurai. Hence this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed. Consequently, Crl.M.P (MD) No.4453 of 2019 stands allowed and Crl.M.P(MD) No.4452 of 2018 is closed. However, the trial Court is directed to complete the trial within a period of six months from the date of receipt of copy of this Order.

8. Further, 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.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (Ad-II)

// True Copy //

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

To

- 1.The Additional Mahila Judge, Madurai.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,  
All Women Police Station,  
Thirupparankundram, Madurai City.
- 3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,  
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,  
Madurai.

das

Crl.O.P. (MD)No.6640 of 2019  
and

Cr.M.P. (MD)Nos.4452 and 4453 of 2019  
08.11.2019

sma (26.11.2019) 3P 4C