



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: **19.11.2019**

CORAM:

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

Crl.O.P. (MD)No.10322 of 2018

and

Crl.M.P (MD)Nos.4602 and 4603 of 2018

1.Deivendran
2.Rajalakshmi
3.Ravi@Ravindran
4.Lalitha

...Petitioners/Accused Nos.1 to 4

Vs.

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

...1st Respondent/Complainant

2.P.Kumaran

...2nd Respondent/Defacto Complainant

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. praying to call for the records in C.C.No.08 of 2018 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.6, Tiruchirappalli and quash the same.

For Petitioners : Mr.N.Mohideen Basha

For R1 : Mr.R.Anandharaj
Additional Public Prosecutor

For R2 : Mr.M.Prakash

O R D E R

This petition has been filed to quash the proceedings in C.C.No.8 of 2018 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.6, Tiruchirappalli, as against the petitioners.

2.Heard both sides.

3. A careful perusal of entire materials available on record, the charge sheet discloses a *prima facie* offence against the petitioners and there is no reason to interfere with the same. 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.

4. 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 petitioner Nos.1, 3 and 4 cannot be considered by this Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C.

5. Hence, the Criminal Original Petition is dismissed insofar as the petitioners 1, 3 and 4 are concerned. However, the learned Judicial Magistrate No.6, Tiruchirappalli, is directed to proceed with the trial and complete the same within a period of six months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. There are totally four accused, in which A2 is none other the mother of the first petitioner. Even according to the case of the prosecution, there is absolutely no specific overt act against the second petitioner/A2. All the allegations are fake in respect of the second petitioner/A2. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case she need not undergo the ordeal of trial. Therefore, this Criminal Original Petition stands allowed insofar as the second petitioner/A2 is concerned.

6. At this juncture, the learned Counsel for the petitioners submitted that the presence of the petitioner Nos. 1, 3 and 4 before the Trial Court may be dispensed with.

7. Accepting the said submission, the personal appearance of the petitioner No.4 is dispensed with and she shall be represented by a counsel after filing appropriate application. The petitioner No.4 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.

8. In the result, this Criminal Original Petition is partly allowed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (Crl.Side)

// True Copy //

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

vsd

To

1.The Judicial Magistrate No.6,
Tiruchirappalli.

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



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

+1 CC to M/s.N. MOHIDEEN BASHA, Advocate (SR-99793[F] dated
20/11/2019)

+1 CC to M/s.M. PRAKASH, Advocate (SR-99831[F] dated 20/11/2019)

Crl.O.P. (MD) No.10322 of 2018
and
Crl.M.P (MD) Nos.4602 and 4603 of 2018
19.11.2019

JMN(11.12.2019) 4P : 6C