



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 12.11.2019

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN

Writ Petition (MD) No.23778 of 2019

V.Pachamal

... Petitioner

Vs

1.The Inspector General of Police
CBCID, Chennai

2. The Superintendent of Police
Ramanathapuram District

3. The Inspector of Police
District Crime Branch
Ramanathapuram
Ramanathapuram District

4.M.Vilvadurai

... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India, to issue a writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents to conduct proper enquiry and take appropriate action against the 4th respondent on the basis of the representation dated 03.09.2019 and 04.11.2019 in accordance with law within a stipulated time period.

For Petitioner : Mr.C.Senthil Murugan

For Respondents : Mr.R.Anandharaj, APP
for RR1 to 3

O R D E R

This writ petition has been filed for issuance of a writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents to conduct proper enquiry and take appropriate action against the 4th respondent on the basis of the representation dated 03.09.2019 and 04.11.2019 in accordance with law

2.This writ petition is nothing but for registration of the complaint. In view of the Judgment of the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court in Crl.O.P.(MD)No.13681 of 2018 and batch of cases, dated 20.09.2018, the petition of this nature is not maintainable before this Court. The relevant portion of the said order is extracted

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



herewith:-

"35. Accordingly, we answer the references in the following manner, while giving certain directions:

(i) Section 482 Cr.P.C. cannot be invoked in all circumstances.

(ii) It is not an alternative remedy to Section 156(3) Cr.P.C. but a repository of inherent power.

(iii) The normal course of remedy on a failure or refusal to record the information is Section 156(3) of the Code of Criminal Procedure after due compliance of Section 154(3) Cr.P.C.

(iv) A petition can be filed invoking the inherent jurisdiction of this Court only after the completion of 15 days from the date of receipt of the information by the Station House Officer. The Registry shall not receive any petition before the expiry of 15 days aforesaid.

(v) No petition shall be entertained without exhausting the remedy under Section 154(3) Cr.P.C.

(vi) An informant can send substance of the information to the Superintendent of Police on knowing the decision of the Station House Officer in not registering the case and proceeding with the preliminary enquiry. After conducting the preliminary enquiry, the Station House Officer's decision in either registering the compliant or closing it will have to be intimated to the informant immediately and in any case not later than 7 days. Once such a decision is made, the informant cannot invoke Section 482 Cr.P.C. as the remedy lies elsewhere.

(vii) The directions issued by the Director General of Police in the circulars referred are to be strictly complied with by all the Station House Officers.

(viii) The affidavit to be filed shall contain particulars regarding the date of complaint, receipt and the date of sending substances of the information to the superintendent of Police under Section 154(3) Cr.P.C. and its receipt. The Registry shall not number any petition without due compliance.

(ix) This Court is not bound to direct the police to register the complaint in all cases not withstanding the breach of time table furnished in Lalitha Kumari's case.

(x) The judicial Magistrates, while dealing the petitions under Sections 156(3) Cr.P.C. are directed to keep in mind the narratives in Lalitha Kumari's case with specific reference to the cases, which might require a preliminary enquiry before issuing a direction



to investigate and after careful perusal of the complaint. The other directions issued by the learned Single Judge in Sugesan Transport's case are upheld.

(xi) Eschewing Section 156(3) Cr.P.C. is only on exceptional and rarest of rare cases. Monstrosity of the offence, extreme official apathy and indifference, need to answer the judicial conscience, and existence of hostile environment are few of the factors to be borne in mind to bring a case under the rarest of rare one."

However, liberty is granted to the petitioner to work out his remedy in accordance with the guidelines given by the Hon'ble Division Bench in the decision referred supra.

3. With the above direction, this Writ Petition is disposed of No costs.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(WRITS)

// True Copy //

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

aav

To

- 1.The Inspector General of Police
CBCID, Chennai
2. The Superintendent of Police
Ramanathapuram District
3. The Inspector of Police
District Crime Branch
Ramanathapuram
Ramanathapuram District
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

+1CC TO MR.C.SENTHIL MURUGAN, Advocate Sr. No.97696

Order made in
W.P (MD) No.23778 of 2019
12.11.2019

MR (CO)
TR(29.11.2019) 3P 6C