



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 21.11.2019

CORAM:

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

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.14706 of 2018

and

Crl.M.P(MD) No.6538 of 2018

Thamizhan @ Tamilarasan

... Petitioner/12th Accused
Vs

1. The Superintendent of Police
Kanyakumari District
Nagercoil

2.State Rep by
The Inspector of Police
Suchindram Police Station
Kanyakumari District
(Crime No.145 of 2018)

...1st and 2nd Respondent/Complainant

3. Prabhu

... 3rd Respondent/Defacto Complainant

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. to Call for the records of the proceedings in Crime No. 145 of 2018 on the file of the first respondent and quash the same against the petitioner herein.


For Petitioner : Mr.P.T.Ramesh Raja

For Respondent : Mr.K.Suyambulinga Bharathi
No.1 & 2 Government Advocate (Crl. side)

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed to quash the proceedings in Crime No. 145 of 2018 on the file of the first respondent police.

2. The learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner 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. 145 of 2018 for the offences under Sections 147,148,341,294(b),323,307 and 506(ii) of IPC and Section 3(1) of TNPPDL Act 1984 and 109 of IPC as



against the petitioner. He would further submit that though initially complaint has been filed against five unnamed persons, thereafter the petitioner and other nine persons were added in the First Information Report. He further submitted that even in the First Information Report the name of the petitioner has been mentioned as Tamilan, but the petitioner's name is Tamilarasan. In this regard he has also submitted a representation before 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 step in 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 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.

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, the petitioner is directed to submit a fresh representation to the second respondent. The second respondent on receipt of the same is directed to consider the same and complete the investigation and file final report before the concerned Magistrate, within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this Order. Further the first respondent is directed to monitor the investigation done by the second respondent.

8. With the above direction the Criminal Original Petition is

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



disposed of . Consequently connected miscellaneous petition is also closed.

WEB COPY

// True Copy //

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CS II)

Sub Assistant Registrar (CS)

aav

To

1. The Superintendent of Police
Kanyakumari District
Nagercoil
2. The Inspector of Police
Suchindram Police Station
Kanyakumari District
3. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

+1 CC to M/s.P.T. RAMESH RAJA, Advocate (SR-100238[F] dated 21/11/2019)

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.14706 of 2018

and

Crl.M.P (MD) No.6538 of 2018

21.11.2019

KK/SAR/10.12.2019/4P-5C/