

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED 16.07.2020

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE Mr.JUSTICE G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN

Crl.O.P.No.6612 of 2018  
and  
Crl.M.P.Nos.3393 and 3394 of 2018

Suresh Naathan

...Petitioner/Accused

Vs

The State  
represented by its  
Inspector of Police  
District Crime Branch  
Cuddalore.

...Respondent/Complainant

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C, praying to call for the records of the proceedings in C.C.No.82 of 2017 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate - II at Cuddalore and quash the same as illegal.

For Petitioner : M/s.P.V.Selvarajan  
(No appearance)

For Respondent : Mr.K.Prabakar  
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

This petition has been filed to quash the proceedings in C.C.No.82 of 2017 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate - II at Cuddalore.

2. It is averred in the petition that at the instance of Mr.C.K.Chandrasekharan, Director of C.K.School of Practical knowledge Matriculation Higher Secondary School, Cuddalore, on account of his animosity and ill-will towards the petitioner/Principal of the said school, a complaint was lodged against the petitioner for misappropriation of funds alleging that the petitioner had not remitted fees to a tune of Rs.23.2 lakhs. It is further averred that the entire case is based on fabricated evidence and the auditors, who claimed to have audited the books of accounts of school are the friends of the defacto complainant and none of the parents, teachers or staff

of the account section were enquired by them during the course of enquiry. The non-production of the statutory books of accounts is deliberate and an adverse inference is required to be drawn for the same. Hence, he prayed for quashing the proceedings in C.C.No.82 of 2017 filed for the alleged offences under Sections 406, 408 and 420 IPC.

3. Heard the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent.

4. 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.

5. Recently, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India dealing in respect of the very same issue in Crl.A.No.1572 of 2019 dated 17.10.2019 in the case of 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."

6. Further the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India also held in the order dated 02.12.2019 in Crl.A.No.1817 of 2019 in the case of M.Jayanthi Vs. K.R.Meenakshi & anr, as follows:

"9. It is too late in the day to seek reference to any authority for the proposition that while invoking the power under Section 482 Cr.P.C for quashing a complaint or a charge, the Court should not embark upon an enquiry into the validity of the evidence available. All that the Court should see is as to whether there are allegations in the complaint which form the basis for the ingredients that constitute certain offences complained of. The Court may also be entitled to see (i) whether the preconditions requisite for taking cognizance have been complied with or not; and (ii) whether the allegations contained in the complaint, even if accepted in entirety, would not constitute the offence alleged.

.....सत्यमेव जयते

13. A look at the complaint filed by the appellant would show that the appellant had incorporated the ingredients necessary for prosecuting the respondents for the offences alleged. The question whether the appellant will be able to prove the allegations in a manner known to law would arise only at a later stage....."

The above judgments are squarely applicable to this case and as such, the points raised by the petitioner 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.82 of 2017 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate - II at Cuddalore. The petitioner is at liberty to raise all the grounds before the trial Court. Considering that the CC is of the year 2017, the trial Court is directed to complete the trial within a period of six months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

8. Accordingly, the Criminal Original Petition is dismissed. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petitions are closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(CS III)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

mra

To

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate - II  
Cuddalore.
- 2.The Inspector of Police  
District Crime Branch  
Cuddalore.
- 3.The Public Prosecutor,  
High Court, Madras.

CrI.O.P.No.6612 of 2018  
and

CrI.M.P.Nos.3393 and 3394 of 2018

AK(CO)  
KKV/05/08/2020

WEB COPY