



WEB COPY

Crl.O.P(MD)No.11664 of 2019

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATE: 04.09.2019

CORAM :

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

Crl.O.P. (MD) No.11664 of 2019

and

Crl.M.P. (MD) No.7333 of 2019

R.Shanmugam

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Inspector of Police,
Papanadu Police Station,
Thanjavur District.
(Crime No.260 of 2014)

2.N.Mohanarajan

... Respondents

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C., to call for the records pertaining to the first information report in Crime No.260 of 2014 on the file of the first respondent police and quash the same.

For Petitioner : Mr.C.Jegananthan

For R1 : Mr.K.Suyambulinga Bharathi,
Government Advocate (Crl.side)

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed to quash first information report in Crime No.260 of 2014 on the file of the first respondent police.

2.It is seen that the petitioner was employed as a Supervisor in TASMACH shop No.7891 situated at Pattukottai. The petitioner along with other accused are said to have misappropriated the accounts to the tune of Rs.1,80,684/- and also mixed water with the alcohol bottles. Hence, the complaint.

3.Heard the learned counsel on either side and perused the materials available on record.

4.It is 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 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.

.....

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."

WEB COPY

5.It is seen from the First Information Report that there is a 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. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed. However, the respondent police is directed to complete the investigation in Crime No.260 of 2014, within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar

// True Copy //

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

Gns
To

1.The Inspector of Police,
Papanadu Police Station,
Thanjavur District.

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

+1 CC to M/s.VEERA ASSOCIATES, Advocate (SR-85434[F] dated
05/09/2019)

Crl.O.P. (MD)No.11664 of 2019
04.09.2019

KK/SAR/03.10.2019/3P-4C/