



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADURAI HIGH COURT

DATED:06.11.2019

CORAM:

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

Crl.O.P. (MD) No.16051 of 2019

and

Crl.M.P (MD) Nos.9543 and 9544 of 2019

... Petitioner/Accused No.1

WEB COPY

Jeyaprakash

Vs.

1. The State through
The Inspector of Police
Nagamalai Puthukottai Police Station
Madurai District
Cr.No.736/17

... Respondent No.1/Complainant

2.Manikandan

... Respondent No.2/Defacto
Complainant

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. praying to quash the case pending in STC No. 509 of 2018 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.VI, Madurai

For Petitioners	: Mr.R.Karunanithi
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 STC No. 509 of 2018 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.VI, Madurai , as against this petitioner.

2. The learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is 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. 736 of 2017 for the offences under Sections 279 and 337 IPC as against the petitioner and taken cognizance in STC No.509 of 2018. Hence he prayed to quash the same.

3. The learned Government Advocate (criminal side) submitted that there are materials available to proceed with the case as against the petitioner herein and at the threshold, the criminal proceedings cannot be quashed and the charges framed against the petitioner has to be gone into a full-fledged trial. Further, he would submit that the trial has also been commenced and hence, he prayed for dismissal of the petition.

4. Heard Mr.R.Karunanithi learned counsel appearing for the petitioner 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:-

WEB COPY

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



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 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 STC No. 509 of 2018 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.VI, Madurai. Hence this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition in Crl.M.P(MD) No.9543 of 2019 is closed and Crl.M.P(MD) No.9544 of 2019 is ordered.. Further the trial court is directed to complete the trial within a period of six months from the date of receipt of a 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 (P&A)

// True Copy //

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

To

1. The Judicial Magistrate No.VI, Madurai
2. The Inspector of Police
Nagamalai Puthukottai Police Station
Madurai District
3. The Additional Public Prosecutor
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court

+1 CC to M/s.R.KARUNANIDHI, Advocate (SR-97155[F] dated08/11/2019)
aav

Crl.O.P.(MD) No.16051 of 2019
and

Crl.M.P(MD) Nos.9543 and 9544 of 2019
06.11.2019

sma (26.11.2019) 3P 5 C

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