

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 16.10.2020

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.N.PRAKASH

CRL.OP.NO.23290 OF 2016

AND

CRL.MP.NO.11317 OF 2016

G.Sasidhar Reddy ... Petitioner/Accused No.1

Vs.

1. State, Represented by
The Inspector of Police
R-4, Soundarapandianar Angadi Police Station
Chennai City.
Crime No.1953 of 2015 ... Respondent/Complainant

2.Kamal @ Chinna ... Respondent/Defacto
Complainant

Prayer:-

Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C., to call for the records and to quash the First Information Report in Crime No.1953 of 2015 on the file of the 1st respondent.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.John Sathyan

For Respondents : Mr.L.Charles Premkumar
Government Advocate
{Crl Sidel for R1
R2 - No appearance

ORDER

This case is taken up through video conferencing.

2. This Criminal Original Petition is filed to quash the FIR in Crime No.1953 of 2015 on the file of the respondent-police.

3. On a complaint lodged by the second respondent on 25.06.2015, the first-respondent registered a case in Crime

No.1953 of 2015 for the offences under Sections 420 IPC r/w.34 IPC., against one Sasidhar Reddy [A1]; Damodhar Reddy [A2] and unnamed others. The crux of the allegation in the complaint is that the complainant hails from neighbouring Andhra Pradesh and that he is addicted to liquor and playing cards; that through one of his friends, he came to know about Mahalakshmi Club in T.Nagar, Chennai and he came there and gambled and lost heavily, due to which, his wife attempted to commit suicide and his family broke. Therefore, the complainant prayed to the respondent-police to take action against Mahalakshmi Club and the persons who are running it. Hence, the FIR came to be registered, for quashing which, the first accused has filed the present petition.

3. Heard Mr.R.John Sathyan, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr.L.Charles Premkumar, learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) for the respondent police.

4. On 07.10.2020, this Court directed the police to produce the second respondent by video conferencing on 16.10.2020. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) on instructions would submit that the whereabouts of the second respondent is not known to the police, despite their best efforts to trace him.

5. In the opinion of this Court, the complaint does not disclose the commission of a cognizable offence. The defacto complainant was not a child to be lured into playing cards by the accused. Even according to defacto complainant, he was addicted to liquor and playing cards.

6. In such view of the matter, this petition is allowed and the entire FIR in Crime No.1953/2015 on the file of the respondent-police, against all the accused, including Damodhar Reddy, is hereby quashed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

सत्यमेव जयते

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

ds

To:

1. The Inspector of Police
R-4, Soundarapandianar Angadi Police Station,
Chennai City.

2. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

+lcc to M/s.N.Anand, Advocate, S.R.No.34566

Crl.OP.No.23290 of 2016

GP(CO)
CS/10/12/2020



WEB COPY