

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS
DATED: 04.03.2020
CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN

CRL.O.P.No.5051 of 2020
and Crl.MP.No.2875 of 2020

1.Veeraraghavan
2.Boopathy

... Petitioners

Vs.

1. The State rep by
The Sub-Inspector of Police,
Kurinjipadi Police Station,
Cuddalore District

... Respondent

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. praying to call for the records relating to the First Information Report in Crime No.271 of 2018 on the file of the respondent.

For Petitioners : Mr.G.Mageshkumar

For Respondent : Mr.M.Mohamed Riyaz

Additional Public Prosecutor.

O R D E R

This petition has been filed to quash the proceedings in FIR in Crime No.271 of 2018 on the file of the respondent for offences under Sections 379, 430 of IPC r/w Section 21(1) of Mines & Minerals (Development & Regulation) Act, 1957 as against the petitioners.

2. The learned Counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners are innocent persons and they have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. Without any base, the respondent police registered a case in Crime No.271 of 2018 for the offences under Sections 379, 430 of IPC r/w Section 21(1) of Mines & Minerals (Development & Regulation) Act, 1957, as against the petitioners. Hence he prayed to quash the same.

3. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor would submit that the investigation is almost completed and the respondent police have only to file final report.

4. Heard Mr.G.Mageshkumar, learned counsel appearing for the petitioners and Mr.M.Mohamed Riyaz, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent.

5. It is seen from the First Information Report that there are specific allegations as against the petitioners to attract the offences, which has to be investigated in depth.

Further the FIR is not an encyclopedia and it does not need to contain all facts and 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 relevant to rely upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India passed in CrI.A.No.255 of 2019 dated 12.02.2019 in the case of Sau. Kamal Shivaji Pokarnekar 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 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.

.....

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 discussion, this Court is not inclined to quash the First Information Report. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is liable to be dismissed. However, the learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the remand itself rejected for want of documents to prove the illegal transportation of river sand, and the petitioners had valid licence to transport river sand. Considering the submissions, the petitioners are directed to produce all the relevant documents before the respondent within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of copy of this order. On receipt of the same, the respondent is directed to consider those documents and file final report after completing the investigation within a period of two weeks thereafter.

8. With the above directions, the criminal original petition is dismissed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(CS)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

lok

To

1. The Sub-Inspector of Police,
Kurinjipadi Police Station, Cuddalore District
 2. The Public Prosecutor, High Court, Madras.
- +1cc to Mr.G.Mageshkumar , Advocate SR.No. 19136

CRL.O.P.No.5051 of 2020
and Crl.MP.No.2875 of 2020