



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: **24.09.2019**

CORAM

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

WEB COPY

CRL.O.P(MD)No.2193 of 2018

and

Cr1.M.P. (MD)No.976 of 2018

R.Bagavathi Chandran

...Petitioner/Accused No.7

Vs.

1.State through

The Inspector of Police,
City Crime Branch,
Tirunelveli.

(In Crime No.40 of 2017

...1st Respondent / Complainant

2.N.Janaky Asirvatham

...2nd Respondent/Defacto Complainant

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. to call for the records in Crime No.40 of 2017 on the file of the first respondent and to quash the same insofar as the petitioner's concerned.

For Petitioner	: Mr.AR.Jeya Rhuthran
For R1	: Mr.K.Suyambulinga Bharathi Government Advocate (Crl. Side)
For R2	: No Appearance

O R D E R

This petition has been filed to quash the proceedings in Crime No.40 of 2017 on the file of the first respondent as against the petitioner.

2.The learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is innocent person and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. Without any base, the first respondent police registered a case in Crime No.40 of 2017 for the offences under Sections 417, 418, 420, 465, 468, 471, 120(B) of IPC., as against the petitioner. Hence, he prayed to quash the same.

3.The learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) appearing for the first respondent would submit that the investigation is still pending and this petition is in premature stage and hence, he prayed for dismissal of this petition.



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

5. It is seen that the petitioner has no case for quashing the present FIR insofar as himself concerned. The petitioner is a main accused in the above crime. Further, though, there was an endorsement of the Sub Registrar, Tuticorin-II as if the will is a forged one, suppressing the same, the petitioner registered three documents in a single day i.e. 15.09.2017 in favour of the accused Nos.1 to 6. The offence committed by the petitioner is very grave in criminal nature. Moreover, the petitioner is Government servant and he has more responsibility, than the ordinary man in following the law of the land. However, floating the law, the petitioner joined his hands with the accused persons and fraudulently registered a power deed and sale agreement in favour of the accused Nos.1 to 6. Further, the petitioner has no grounds for in favour filing the present criminal original petition. However, without having any valid reason, the petitioner filed present criminal original petition by setting out the vague grounds.

6. 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.

7. 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.



WEB COPY

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."

8. 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.

9. In view of the above, this Court is not inclined to quash the FIR. Accordingly, this criminal original petition is dismissed. However, the first respondent is directed to complete the investigation and file a final report within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of copy of this order, before the jurisdictional Magistrate. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is also dismissed.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CS-III)

/TRUE COPY/

Sub Assistant Registrar

vsd
To

- 1.The Inspector of Police,
City Crime Branch,
Tirunelveli.
- 2.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

CRL.O.P (MD)No.2193 of 2018
and
Cr1.M.P. (MD)No.976 of 2018
24.09.2019