



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

Date of Reservation	24.06.2019
Date of Order	20.09.2019

WEB COPY

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE T.KRISHNAVALLICrl.R.C(MD)No.222 of 2019

N.Chandrasekara Vellaiyan

: Revision Petitioner/
De-facto complainant/PW1

Vs.

1.State represented by
The Inspector of Police,
Woraiyur Police Station,
Trichy District.
(Crime No.670 of 2011)

2.T.Nagappan

: Respondents

Prayer: Criminal Revision has been filed under Sections 397 and 401 of Criminal Procedure Code, against the order, dated 31.12.2018 passed by the Judicial Magistrate No.IV, Tiruchirappalli, in Cr.M.P.No.10944 of 2012 in C.C.No.84 of 2012 and to direct the trial court to accept the documents produced along with the petition in Cr.M.P.No.10944 of 2012.

For Revision Petitioner : Mr.P.T.Ramesh Raja

For 1st Respondent : Mr.APG Ohm Chairma Prabhu
Government Advocate
(Criminal side)For 2nd Respondent : No appearance**ORDER**

This Criminal Revision is directed against the order, dated 31.12.2018 passed by the Judicial Magistrate No.IV, Tiruchirappalli, in Cr.M.P.No.10944 of 2012 in C.C.No.84 of 2012 and to direct the trial court to accept the documents produced along with the petition in Cr.M.P.No.10944 of 2012.

2.The petitioner is the de-facto complainant in C.C.No.84 of 2012 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate No.IV, Tiruchirappalli. The petitioner produced certain important documents to the 1st respondent police during investigation, however, they were not filed with the charge sheet. The 1st respondent police filed Cr.M.P.No.10944 of 2018 in C.C.No.84 of 2012 to receive the above documents. The learned Magistrate dismissed the same on 31.12.2018. Hence, the petitioner is before this court.



3. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned Government Advocate (Criminal side) appearing for the 1st respondent and perused the materials available on record.

4. The main contention raised on the side of the petitioner/de-facto complainant is that he produced certain necessary documents to the first respondent during investigation, but they were not filed at the time of filing charge sheet and hence, the 1st respondent filed CrI.M.P.No.10944 of 2018 in C.C.No.84 of 2012 to receive additional document, but the trial court dismissed the petition and the petition mentioned documents are necessary for proving his case and prays that the criminal revision has to be allowed.

5. It is seen from the records that the dispute is with regard to civil in nature. As per the prosecution case, the occurrence took place in T.S.No.27/3B. But the petitioner produced documents in respect of T.S.No.27/3A. Further, in this case, charge sheet was filed during the year of 2012. But the petitioner filed this petition highly belatedly. The petitioner has not explained in his petition how the petition mentioned documents are relevant to this case, since they are not in his name. The reasons stated by the petitioner are not acceptable. Hence, in the interest of justice, this criminal revision is liable to be dismissed.

6. In the result, this criminal revision fails and the same is dismissed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar ()

// True Copy //

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

er
To,

1. The Judicial Magistrate No.IV,
Tiruchirappalli.

2. The Inspector of Police,
Woraiyur Police Station,
Trichy District.

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