



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 25.11.2019

CORAM

WEB COPY

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE **G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN**

CRL.O.P. (MD).No.10065 of 2019

and

CRL.M.P (MD)No.6341 of 2019

1.S.Palpandi
2.K.Annamalai
3.B.Prabhakaran
4.B.Ramkumar
5.P.K.Balasubramanian

... Petitioners

Vs.

State rep.by

1.The Sub Inspector of Police,
Sivakasi Town Police Station,
Sivakasi- 626 123.

2.The Inspector of Police,
Sivakasi Town Police Station,
Sivakasi - 626 123.

3.The Superintendent of Police,
Virudhunagar District,
Virudhunagar - 626 002.

4.Pandi

... Respondents

(R4 impleaded as per the order dated 29.07.2019
in Crl.M.P(MD)No.6787 of 2019 in
Crl.O.P(MD)No.10065 of 2019)

PRAYER:Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C, to call for the records and papers relating to F.I.R in Crime No.249 of 2019 on the file of the Sub Inspector of Police, Sivakasi Town Police Station, Sivakasi, Virudhunagar District and quash the same.

For Petitioner : Mr.K.M.Ramesh
For R1 to R3 : Mr.K.Suyambulinga Bharathi,
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

For R4 : Mr.Mohaboob Athiff.
For M/s.Ajmal Associates



ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed to quash the proceedings in Crime No. 249 of 2019 on the file of the first respondent police.

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. 249 of 2019 for the offences under Sections 294(b), 323, 324 and 506 (ii) of IPC. He would also submit that there was a C.C TV footage for the entire occurrence.

3.The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) on behalf of the official respondents would submit that the investigation is almost completed and the respondent police have only to file final report.

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

5.It is seen from the First Information Report that there are specific allegation as against the petitioners, 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 Pokarnekhar 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 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.

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 discussion, this Court is not inclined to quash the First Information Report. Hence this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed.



8. The petitioners are directed to produce the C.CTV footage and other evidence with regard to the occurrence before the second respondent. The second respondent is directed to consider the materials produced by the petitioners and also follow the procedure laid down under the Police Standing Order 588 (A) and complete the investigation and file final report before the concerned Magistrate, within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. The entire investigation shall be monitored by the third respondent. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CS-II)

// True Copy //

/ /2020

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

To

- 1.The Sub Inspector of Police,
Sivakasi Town Police Station,
Sivakasi- 626 123.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
Sivakasi Town Police Station,
Sivakasi - 626 123.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Virudhunagar District,
Virudhunagar - 626 002.
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

+1 CC to M/s.K.M. RAMESH, Advocate (SR-100949[F] 25/11/2019

CRL.O.P. (MD) .No.10065 of 2019

and

CRL.M.P (MD) No.6341 of 2019

25.11.2019

das

SDS (08.01.2020) 4P-6C