



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 12.11.2019

CORAM:

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

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16285 of 2019

and

Crl.M.P(MD) No.9695 of 2019

WEB COPY

Malathi

... Petitioner

Vs

1. State rep by
The Inspector of Police
Central Crime Branch Police Station
Madurai City

2. Sikkanthar ... Respondents

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. to Call for the records pertaining to the FIR in Crime No.46 of 2018 on the file of the first respondent police and quash the same so far as the petitioner is concerned.

For Petitioner : Mr.Niranjana S.Kumar

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

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed to quash the proceedings in Crime No.46 of 2018 on the file of the first respondent police.

2. The learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petition is innocent he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. Without any base, the first respondent police registered a case in Crime No.46 of 2018 for the offences under Sections 379, 406, 420 and 506(ii) of IPC as against the petitioner. The learned counsel for the petitioner further submitted that the petitioner is the wife of the first accused and she has nothing to do with the crime. He also submitted that even on earlier three occasions, the second respondent lodged a complaint and the same has been closed after enquiry. Thereafter the second respondent filed private complaint and the same has been forwarded under Section 156(3) Cr.P.C. Based on the same, the first respondent registered a case and also during the pendency of the same, she appeared before the first respondent and gave statements along with the entire evidence showing that the petitioner is not involved in any crime as alleged by the first respondent.



3. The learned Government Advocate(Crl.Side) would submit that the investigation is almost completed and the respondent police have only to file final report.

4. Heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.

5.It is seen from the First Information Report that there are 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 investigate, grab and unearth the crime in accordance with the procedures prescribed in the Code.

6.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 Pokarnekar 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 by 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.

6.....

7.....

8.....

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."

7. In view of the above discussion, this Court is not inclined to quash the First Information Report. Further the first respondent is directed to consider the submission made by the learned counsel for the petitioner and to complete the investigation and file final report before the concerned Magistrate, within a period of three weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this Order. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar ()

// True Copy //

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)



1. The Inspector of Police
Central Crime Branch Police Station
Madurai City

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

+1 CC to Mr.NIRANJAN.S. KUMAR, Advocate (SR-97622[F] dated
12/11/2019)

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16285 of 2019
and
Crl.M.P(MD) No.9695 of 2019

12.11.2019

VB(27.11.2019) 4P 4C