



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.13012 of 2019

and

Crl.M.P(MD) No.8005 of 2019

WEB COPY

1. Abthulkather Jeylani
2. Velusamy
3. Abdul Muthaleeb ... Petitioners/Accused 1 to 3
Vs

1. The State of Tamil Nadu
Rep.by the Sub Inspector of Police
Vadamaduri Police Station
Dindigul District ...Respondent/Complainant

2. Nannammal ... Respondent/Defacto Complainant

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. to Call for the records relating to the FIR in Crime No. 118 of 2018 on the file of the first respondent police and quash the same.

For Petitioners : Mr.K.Appadurai
For Respondent : Mr.K.Suyambulinga Bharathi
No.1 Government Advocate (Crl. side)

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed to quash the proceedings in Crime No. 118 of 2018 on the file of the first respondent police.

2. The learned Counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the petitions 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. 118 of 2018 for the offences under Sections 294(b) and 506(ii) of IPC, as against the petitioners. He would further submit that on their complaint the first respondent registered a case against the second respondent and her family members in Crime No. 91 of 2018 for the offences under Sections 294(b), 323 and 506 (ii) of IPC. Hence he prayed to quash the same.

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

4. Heard Mr.K.Appadurai, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and Mr.K.Suyambulinga Bharathi, learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the first respondent.



5. There are totally three accused in Crime No.118 of 2018 in which the petitioner is arrayed as A1 to A3. The case was registered for the offences under Sections 294(b) and 506(ii) of IPC. The case of the prosecution is that due to some civil dispute, the petitioners herein abused the defacto complainant and threatened with dire consequences. It is also seen from the statement recorded under Section 161(3) Cr.P.C that there are evidences to attract the offence under Sections 294(b) and 506(ii) of IPC. 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.

.....

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 seen from the First Information Report that there is a 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.

and there are specific allegations against all the accused persons.

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. However, the respondent police is directed to complete the investigation in both cases 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. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.


Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CS-II)

// True Copy //

Sub Assistant Registrar (CS)

aav



To

1. The Sub Inspector of Police
Vadamaduri Police Station
Dindigul District

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

+1 CC to M/s.K.APPADURAI, Advocate (SR-88008[F] dated
20/09/2019)

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.13012 of 2019
and
Crl.M.P(MD) No.8005 of 2019
19.09.2019

KM/(04.09.2019) 4P 4C