



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT
DATED : 26.11.2019

CORAM :

WEB COPY

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.17408 of 2019

and

Cr.M.P.(MD)Nos.10250 and 10251 of 2019

Nagaraj

... Petitioner/Accused

Vs.

1.The State rep by

The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Thiruparankundram,
Madurai District.
Crime No.21 of 2014.

... Respondent No.1/Complainant

2.Petchiyammal

... Respondent No.2/Defacto Complainant

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition filed under section 482 of Criminal Procedure Code, to call for the records relating to the case in C.C.No.166 of 2016, on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate cum Additional Mahila Court, Madurai District and quash the same.

For Petitioner
For R1

: Mr.B.Prahalad Ravi
: Mr.K.Suyambulinga Bharathi
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

O R D E R

This petition has been filed to quash the proceedings in C.C.No.166 of 2016, pending on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate cum Additional Mahila Court, Madurai District.

2. The learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is an 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.67 of 2014 for the offences under Sections 498(A), 494, 495 and 506(i) IPC, as against the petitioner and taken cognizance for in C.C.No.166 of 2016. Hence he prayed to quash the same.

3. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) would submit that the trial already commenced in C.C.No.166 of 2016 and P.W.1 was already examined.



4. Heard Mr.B.Prahalad Ravi, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, Mr.K.Suyambulinga Bharathi, learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the first respondent.

5.It is 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:-

" 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 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 petitioners 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 C.C.No.166 of 2016, on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate cum Additional Mahila Court, Madurai. Hence, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed. The trial Court is directed to complete the trial within a period of three months from the date of receipt of copy of this Order. However, the petitioner is at liberty to raise all his points before the trial Court.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (records)

// True Copy //

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

das

To

1.The Judicial Magistrate cum Additional Mahila Court,
Madurai.

2.The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Thiruparankundram,
Madurai District.

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

+1 CC to Mr.B. PRAHALAD RAVI, Advocate (SR-102240[F] dated
28/11/2019)

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.17408 of 2019

and

Cr.M.P.(MD)Nos.10250 and 10251 of 2019

26.11.2019

MK (20.12.2019) 3P 5C

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