



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 15.11.2019

CORAM:

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

Crl.O.P. (MD) .No.16829 of 2019

WEB COPY

1. Vellaisamy
2. Karuppasamy ... Petitioners/Accused-1 & 2

Vs.

1. The State,
Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Kovilpatti, Thoothukudi District.
(Crime No. 12 of 2018) ...1st Respondent/Complainant
2. S. Pitchammal ... 2nd Respondent/Defacto Complainant

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. to call for the records pursuant to the FIR in Crime No.12 of 2018 pending on the file of the Inspector of Police, All Women Police Station, Kovilpatti, Thoothukudi District and quash the same.

For Petitioner : Mr.R. Amarnath

For R-1 : Mr.K.Suyambulinga Bharathi
Government Advocate (Crl. side)

ORDER

The Criminal Original Petition has been filed to quash the proceedings of FIR in Crime No.12 of 2018 on the file of the first respondent police for the offences under Sections 5(i) and 6 of Protection of Child from Sexual Offences Act, 2012 as against the petitioners.

2. The learned Counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners did not commit any offences as alleged in the impugned FIR. Without any base, the first respondent police registered a case as against the petitioner in Crime No. 12 of 2018 for the offences under Sections 5(i) and 6 of Protection of Child from Sexual Offences Act, 2012. Hence they prayed to quash the same.

3.The learned Government Advocate (criminal side) would submit that the investigation is still pending and this petition is in



premature stage. He would further submit that the petitioner has committed serious offence and that the victim also seems to be mentally retarded and hence, he prayed for dismissal of this petition.

4. Perused the materials available on record.

5. It is seen from the First Information Report that there are specific allegation as against the petitioners, 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



WEB COPY

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, 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 within a period of **Four Weeks** from the date of receipt of copy of this Order, before the concerned jurisdictional Magistrate.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CS-III)

// True Copy //

/ /2020

Sub Assistant Registrar (CS)



ksa

To

WEB COPY

1. The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Kovilpatti, Thoothukudi District.
2. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

Crl.O.P. (MD) .No.16829 of 2019
15.11.2019

KM/ (08.01.2020) 4P 3C