



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 22.11.2019

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN

Crl.O.P.(MD) No.13547 of 2018

and

Crl.M.P.(MD)No.6115 of 2018

Muthupandi

... Petitioner/Sole Accused

Vs.

1.The Inspector of Police
Kayatharu Police Station
Thoothukudi District.

... 1st Respondent/Complainant

2.Ponnammal

... 2nd Respondent/Defacto Complainant

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. praying to call for the records relating to the FIR in Crime No. 163 of 2018 on the file of the first respondent herein and quash the same as illegal so far as petitioner is concerned.

For Petitioner	:	Mr.M.Prabu
For R1	:	Mr.R.Anandharaj
		Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed to quash the F.I.R in Crime No.163 of 2018, on the file of the first respondent.

2.The learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is an innocent 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.163 of 2018, as against the petitioner. He would further submit that no such alleged Account No.20286468024 in the State Bank of India, Kovilpatti Branch is there, as per the report of the Chief Manager, SBI, Kovilpatti Branch. Hence he prayed to quash the same.

3.The learned Additional Public Prosecutor would submit that the investigation is almost completed and the respondent police have only to file final report.

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

5.Considering the fact that the investigation is almost over, this Court cannot quash the First Information Report at this



stage. . 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 petitioner, 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.

7.This Criminal Original Petition is dismissed. However, the petitioner is directed to produce all the documents proof to show that the petitioner has no such account lying in the State Bank of India, Kovilpatti Branch, before the first respondent forthwith. On receipt of the same, the first respondent is directed to consider the same and file a final report within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

8.With the above observation, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CS-III)

// True Copy //

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

Ls

To

1.The Inspector of Police
Kayatharu Police Station
Thoothukudi District.

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

Crl.O.P.(MD) No.13547 of 2018
22.11.2019