



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADURAI HIGH COURT  
DATED:14.11.2019  
CORAM:

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

WEB COPY

Crl.O.P.(MD) No.10983 of 2018  
and  
Crl.M.P(MD) Nos.4961 and 4962 of 2018

1.Govindharaj @ Govindharajan  
2.Sakunthala  
3.Selvarathi

... Petitioners/A-2 to A-4

Vs.

1. The State rep by  
The Inspector of Police,  
All Women Police Station,  
Theni, Theni District.  
(Crime No.2 of 2017)

2. Reena

... Respondents

**PRAYER:** Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. praying to Call for the records of the in C.C.No.248 of 2017 pending on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Theni and quash the same as illegal as against these petitioners.

For Petitioners : Mr.A.K.Manickam

For Respondents :Mr.K.Suyambulinga Bharathi  
No.1 Government Advocate(Crl.Side)

### **O R D E R**

This petition has been filed to quash the proceedings in C.C.No.248 of 2017 in Crime No.2 of 2017 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Theni, as against these petitioners.

2.The learned Counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners are innocent and they did not commit any offence as alleged by the prosecution. Without any base, the first respondent police registered a case in Crime No.2 of 2017 for the offences under Sections 498(A), 294(b), 506(1), 406 of IPC, Section 4 of TN Prohibition of Harassment of Woman Act, 2002 and Section 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 as against the petitioners and taken cognizance in CC 248 of 2017. Hence they prayed to quash the same.



3.The learned Government Advocate(Crl.Side) would submit that some of the witnesses have been examined in this case.

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

5.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.

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."

WEB COPY

The above judgment is squarely applicable to this case and as such, the points raised by the petitioner 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.248 of 2017 in Crime No.2 of 2017 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Theni. Hence this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition in Crl.M.P(MD) No.4961 of 2018 is closed and Crl.M.P(MD) No.4962 of 2018 stands allowed. 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 petitioners is dispensed with and they shall be represented by a counsel after filing appropriate application. The petitioners 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 (writ)

// True Copy //

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

aav

To

1. The Judicial Magistrate, Theni.

2. The Inspector of Police,  
All Women Police Station,  
Theni, Theni District.

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

Crl.O.P. (MD) No.10983 of 2018  
and

Crl.M.P(MD) Nos.4961 and 4962 of 2018  
14.11.2019

VB(02.12.2019) 3P 4C

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