



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 26.09.2019

CORAM

WEB COPY

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN

CRL.O.P (MD) No.2913 of 2018

and

CrI.M.P.(MD) Nos.1324 and 1325 of 2018

Dr.Swaminathan

... Petitioner/A2

Vs

1.The State rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch Unit - 1,
Madurai crime No.381/2013

:1st Respondent/Complainant

2.N.K.Ramasamy

3.The Inspector of Police,
Sellur Police Station,
Madurai (crime No.381/13)

:2nd Respondents/Defacto Complainant

(R3 impleaded as per order dated 12.03.2018
made in CrI.M.P.(MD) Nbo.1722 of 2018)

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C, praying to call for the records relating to C.C.No.92 of 2014 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate No.II, Madurai and quash the same as against the petitioner.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Ravi

For Respondents : Mr.K.Suyambulinga bharathi,
G.A. (CrI. Side) for R1 & R3


No Appearance for R2

O R D E R

This petition has been filed to quash the proceedings in C.C.No.92 of 2014 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate No.II, Madurai as against the petitioner.

2.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is an innocent person and he has been falsely

<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/>



implicated in the case with oblique motive. Originally, the name of the petitioner was not shown in the FIR and during investigation only his name has been included, since the father of the petitioner, who was an accused, died. The petitioner has no way connected with the alleged crime. There is no specific allegation made by the defacto complainant as against the petitioner and there is no specific overt act found against the petitioner except the categorical statement that the petitioner along with other accused persons had entered into the alleged forged sale agreement with V.R.G.Palanikuman and obtained electricity connection by forging the signature of the deceased persons. Hence, he prayed for quashment of the criminal proceedings.

3.The learned Government Advocate (criminal side) submitted that there are materials available to proceed with the case as against the petitioner herein and at the threshold, the criminal proceedings cannot be quashed and the charges framed against the petitioner have to be gone into a full-fledged trial. Further, he would submit that the trial has also been commenced and P.W.1 has been examined as Chief and hence, he prayed for dismissal of the petition.

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

5.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** in the case of **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.

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."

6.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



WEB COPY

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.

7. In view of the above citations, the criminal proceedings against the petitioner cannot be quashed at its threshold and it has to be gone in to by full fledged trial. Further, in this case, trial has also been commenced. Therefore, the charges cannot be quashed at this stage and this criminal original petition is liable to be dismissed.

8. Accordingly, this criminal original petition is dismissed with the liberty to the petitioner to raise all the grounds before the trial Court. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are also dismissed. However, considering the fact that the petitioner is 69 years old, the learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Madurai, is directed to complete the trial and dispose of the case, within a period of six months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. The personal appearance of the petitioner before the trial Court is dispensed with, except the dates on which, the trial Judge insisted the petitioner for his appearance.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CS-II)

// True Copy //

Sub Assistant Registrar (CS)

Arul

To

1. The State rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch Unit - 1,
Madurai crime No.381/2013



+1 CC to Mr.S. RAVI, Advocate SR-90151.

Order made in
C.R.L.O.P (MD) No.2913 of 2018
26.09.2019

CS (14.10.2019) 5P 6C