



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: **19.09.2019**

CORAM

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

CRL.O.P(MD)No.2886 of 2018

and

CrI.M.P. (MD)No.1309 of 2018

WEB COPY

K.G.Nandhakumar

... Petitioner/Accused No.1

Vs

1.State rep. by

The Inspector of Police,
City Crime Branch,
Trichy City.

(In Cr.No.65 of 2017)

...1st Respondent / Complainant

2.Kannan

...2nd Respondent/Defacto Complainant

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. to call for the records pertaining to FIR in Crime No.65 of 2017 dated 25.11.2017 on the file of the 1st respondent police and quash the same insofar as the petitioner is concerned.

For Petitioner	:	Mr.A.Joel Paul Antony
For R1	:	Mr.K.Suyambulinga Bharathi Government Advocate (Crl. Side)
For R2	:	Mr.M.Ponnaiah

O R D E R

This petition has been filed to quash the proceedings in Crime No.65 of 2017 dated 25.11.2017 on the file of the 1st respondent police as against the petitioner.

2.The learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the second respondent is colluded with the other accused persons and involved in this crime. He further submitted 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.65 of 2017 for the offences under Sections 120(b), 465, 468, 471 and 420 of IPC., as against the petitioner. Hence he prayed to quash the same.

3.The learned Government Advocate (criminal side) 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 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.....

WEB COPY

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. 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.

8. 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 thoroughly with the banker and file a final report within a period of eight 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(CS)

To

1.The Inspector of Police,
City Crime Branch,
Trichy City.

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

+1 CC to Mr.M.PONNIAH, Advocate SR-87848.

CRL.O.P (MD)No.2886 of 2018

and

Cr1.M.P. (MD)No.1309 of 2018

19.09.2019

CS (09.10.2019) 4P 4C