



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 13.11.2019

CORAM :

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

CrI.O.P.(MD)No.11378 of 2018

and

Cr.M.P.(MD)Nos.5175 & 5176 of 2018

WEB COPY

Murugan

... Petitioner/Accused No.1

Vs.

1.The Inspector of Police,
Rajapalayam North Police Station,
Virudhunagar District.
(Crime No.375 of 2016)

... Respondent/Complainant

2.Sivasubramaniyan

... Respondent/Defacto
Complainant

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition filed under section 482 of Criminal Procedure Code, to call for the records in S.C.No.58 of 2017 on the file of the learned Principal District and Sessions Court, Srivilliputtur and quash the same as against this petitioner.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Muniyandi

For R1 : Mr.K.Suyambulinga Bharathi
Government Advocate (CrI.Side)

For R2 : Mr.A.Sivaji

O R D E R

This petition has been filed to quash the proceedings in S.C.No.58 of 2017 on the file of the learned Principal District and Sessions Court, Srivilliputtur.

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.375 of 2016 for the offences under Sections 147, 148, 447, 294 (b), 506 (ii), 109 (b) of IPC r/w 34 of IPC and Section 4 of TNPPDL Act, as against the petitioner and taken cognizance for in S.C.No.58 of 2017. Hence he prayed to quash the same.

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

4. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, learned counsel appearing for the respondents 1 and 2 and learned counsel appearing for the third 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 S.C.No.58 of 2017 on the file of the learned Principal District and Sessions Court, Srivilliputtur. Hence this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed. Consequently, Crl.M.P(MD) No.5176 of 2018 stands allowed and Crl.M.P(MD) No.5175 of 2018 is closed. However, the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) would submit that the the learned Principal and Sessions Court, Srivilliputtur, deleted the offence under Section 4 of TNPPDL Act and as such, the matter has been again remitted back to the learned Judicial Magistrate, Rajapalayam. Therefore, the learned Judicial Magistrate, Rajapalayam 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 ()

// True Copy //

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

dss

To

1. The Principal District and Sessions Court, Srivilliputtur.

2. The Judicial Magistrate, Rajapalayam.

3. The Inspector of Police,
Rajapalayam North Police Station,
Virudhunagar District.

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

+1 CC to Mr.S.MUNIYANDI, Advocate (SR-98104[F] dated 14/11/2019)

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.11378 of 2018

and

Cr.M.P.(MD)Nos.5175 & 5176 of 2018

13.11.2019