



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 06.11.2019

CORAM :

WEB COPY

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

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.9249 of 2018

and

Cr.M.P.(MD)Nos.4035 & 4036 of 2018

Marimuthu

... Petitioner/Sole Accused

Vs.

1.The State through
The Inspector of Police,
CCIW, Pudukkottai.

... 1st Respondent/Complainant

2.L.Cheliyan,
Deputy Registrar of
Co-operative Societies,
Pudukkottai.

... 2nd Respondent/Defacto
Complainant

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition filed under section 482 of Criminal Procedure Code, to call for the records relating to case in C.C.No.580 of 2018 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.2, Pudukkottai and quash the same as against the petitioner.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Ganapathi Subramanian

For R1 : Mr.R.Anandharaj
Additional Public Prosecutor

O R D E R

This petition has been filed to quash the proceedings in C.C.No.580 of 2018 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.2, Pudikkottai.

2. The learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is an 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. 6 of 2017 for the offences under Sections 408, 420, 467, 468 and 477 (A) of IPC as against the petitioner and the same has been taken cognizance in C.C.No.580 of 2018. Hence he prayed to quash the same.



3. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor would submit that some of the witnesses have been examined in this case.

4. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the first respondent.

5. It is 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."

6. Recently, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India held in respect of the very same issue in **Crl.A.No.1572 of 2019 - Central Bureau of Investigation Vs. Arvind Khanna**, wherein, it has been held as follows:

"19. After perusing the impugned order and on hearing the submissions made by the learned senior counsels on both sides, we are of the view that the impugned order passed by the High Court is not sustainable. In a petition filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C., the High Court has recorded findings on several disputed facts and allowed the petition. Defence of the accused is to be tested after appreciating the evidence during trial. The very fact that the High Court, in this case, went into the most minute details, on the allegations made by the appellant-C.B.I., and the defence put-forth by the respondent, led us to a conclusion that the High Court



has exceeded its power, while exercising its inherent jurisdiction under Section 482 Cr.P.C.

20. In our view, the assessment made by the High Court at this stage, when the matter has been taken cognizance by the Competent Court, is completely incorrect and uncalled for."

- The above judgment is squarely application to this case and as such, the points raised by the petitioners cannot be considered by this Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C.

7. In view of the above discussion, this Court is not inclined to quash the proceedings in C.C.No.580 of 2018 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.2, Pudukkottai. Hence this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed. Consequently, Crl.M.P (MD) No.4036 of 2018 stands allowed and Crl.M.P(MD) No.4035 of 2018 is closed. However, the trial Court is directed to complete the trial within a period of six months from the date of receipt of copy of this Order.

8. Further, the personal appearance of the petitioner is dispensed with and he shall be represented by a counsel after filing appropriate application. The petitioner shall be present before the Court at the time of furnishing of copies, framing charges, questioning under Section 313 Cr.P.C. and at the time of passing judgment.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CS-II)

// True Copy //

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

dss

To

1.TheJudicial Magistrate No.2, Pudukkottai.

2.The Inspector of Police, CCIW, Pudukkottai.

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

+1 CC to M/s.P.GANAPATHI SUBRAMANIAN, Advocate (SR-96847[F] dated 07/11/2019)

Crl.O.P. (MD)No.9249 of 2018

and

Cr.M.P. (MD)Nos.4035 & 4036 of 2018

06.11.2019

JMN (22.11.2019) 3P : 5C

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