



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

Dated : 15.11.2019

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN

CRL.O.P (MD) Nos.16925 of 2017 and 3989 of 2018

and

Crl.M.P.(MD) Nos.11139, 11140 of 2017 and 1960 of 2018

Maruthupandi

... Petitioner/A1 in
Crl.O.P.16925/2017

1.Shanmugaraj

2.Rukmani

3.Bama

4.Vijayakumar

... Petitioners/A2 to A5
Crl.O.P.3989/2018

Vs

1.The State of rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Keelakarai,
Ramanathapuram District,
Crime No.4 of 2016

...1st Respondent/Complainant in
both petitioner

2.Devi

...2nd Respondent/ Defacto complainant
in both petitions

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petitions filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C, praying to call for the charge sheet in C.C.No.350 of 2017 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate No.1, Ramanathapuram and quash the same as illegal and devoid of merits.

For Petitioners

: Mr.M.Jegadeesh Pandian

For Respondents

: Mr.K.Suyambulinga Bharathi, G.A.

(Crl. Side) for R1

Mr.S.C.Herold Singh, for R2
(in both petitions)

O R D E R

These petitions have been filed to quash the criminal proceedings in C.C.No.350 of 2017 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate No.1, Ramanathapuram.

2.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the petitioner/A1 in Crl.O.P.(MD) No.16925 of 2017 is the husband of the defacto complainant and the petitioners/A2 to A5 in Crl.O.p.(MD) No.3989 of 2018 are the in-laws of the defacto

complainant and they are innocent persons and they have been falsely implicated in the case with oblique motive. The respondent police without looking into the factual facts of the case registered the case only on the false allegations for the offences under Sections 498(A) IPC and Section 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Woman Harassment Act and without properly investigating the persons involved in the crime, they filed the charge sheet. Hence. He prayed for quashment of the criminal proceedings.

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

4. Heard both sides and perused the materials available on records.

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**, dated 17.10.2019 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."

7.Considering the above said judgments, this Court is of the view that there are specific allegations as against the petitioners. The points raised by the learned counsel appearing for the petitioners could be decided only at the time of trial. Further, the mixed question of facts can not be considered by this Court that too under Section 48 of Cr.P.C. Therefore, the above judgments are 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.

8.In view of the above discussions, these criminal original petitions are dismissed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are also dismissed. The trial Judge is directed to complete the trial and dispose of the case in C.C.No.350 of 2017 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate No.1, Ramanathapuram, within a period of six (6) months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. The personal appearance of the petitioners/A2 to A5 in Crl.O.P.(MD) No.3989 of 2018 alone is dispensed with before the trial Court, except the dates on which, the trial Judge insisted the petitioners/A2 to A5 for their personal appearance. The petitioner/A1 in Crl.O.P.(MD) No.16925 of 2017 is directed to appear before the trial Court on all hearing dates, without fail.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (AD-II)

// True Copy //

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)



Arul
To

1.The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Keelakarai,
Ramanathapuram District.

2.The Judicial Magistrate No.1,
Ramanathapuram

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

+1 CC to M/s.S.C.HEROLD SINGH, Advocate (SR-99461[F] dated
19/11/2019)

Order made in
CRL.O.P (MD) No.16925 of 2017 and
3989 of 2018
15.11.2019

SMA/16/12/19/4P/5C