



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: **26.11.2019**

CORAM:

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

Crl.O.P. (MD)No.21254 of 2018

and

Crl.M.P. (MD)No.9821 of 2018

WEB COPY

S.Paulraj

...Petitioner/Sole Accused

Vs.

1.State Represented by

The Sub-Inspector of Police,
Valliyoor Police Station,
Tirunelveli District.
(Crime No.528 of 2014)

... 1st Respondent/Complainant

2.P.Thirunagalingam

...2nd Respondent/Defacto Complainant

Prayer: Criminal Original petition filed under Section 482 of Code of Criminal Procedure, to call for the records pertaining to the First Information Report in Crime No.528 of 2014, dated 19.12.2014 on the file of the first respondent registered under Section 324 of IPC and Section 3 of TNPPDL and quash the same as illegal.

For Petitioner

: Mr.T.Thirumurugan

For R1

: Mr.R.Anandharaj

Additional Public Prosecutor

O R D E R

This petition has been filed to quash the proceedings in Crime No.528 of 2014, dated 19.12.2014 on the file of the first respondent as against the petitioner.

2.The learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is 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.528 of 2014 for the offences under Section 324 of IPC r/w 3 of TNPPDL Act, as against the petitioner. Hence, he prayed to quash the same.

3.The learned Additional Public Prosecutor would submit that already investigation was completed and because of the pendency of the Criminal Original Petition the first respondent could not file a 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 Pokarnekhar 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.....

WEB COPY

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, this Court is not inclined to quash the FIR. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed. However, the first respondent is directed to complete the investigation and file a final report before the jurisdictional Magistrate concerned, within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.


Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CS-III)

// True Copy //

Sub Assistant Registrar (CS)

vsd



To

1.The Sub-Inspector of Police,
Valliyoor Police Station,
Tirunelveli District.

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

+1 CC to Mr.T. THIRUMURUGAN, Advocate (SR-101452[F] dated
26/11/2019)

Crl.O.P. (MD)No.21254 of 2018
and
Crl.M.P. (MD)No.9821 of 2018
26.11.2019

VB(06.01.2020) 4P 4C