



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

Date : 29/10/2020

PRESENT

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice **G.K. ILANTHIRAIYAN**

CRL OP(MD).No.21890 of 2016

and

Crl.M.P(MD)No.11291 of 2016

WEB COPY

- 1.K.Engles @ Kalyanasundaram
- 2.Dr.K.Krishnamurthy
- 3.K.Karthigai Rani
- 4.A.Anitha Devi
- 5.R.Anandan

...Petitioners/Accused Nos.1 to 5

Vs.

- 1.State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Tallakulam,
Madurai District.
(Crime No.26 of 2016)

...1st Respondent/Complainant

- 2.Vidyapriyadarshini

...2nd Respondent/Defacto Complainant

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. praying to call for the First Information Report pertaining to the case in Crime No.26 of 2016 on the file of the 1st respondent police and quash the same.

For Petitioners	:	Mr.G.Ganesh Kumar
For R1	:	Mr.R.Erottuchamy
		Government Advocate(Crl.Side)
For R2	:	Mr.M.Muniraj

O R D E R

This petition has been filed to quash the First Information Report in Crime No.26 of 2016 on the file of the first respondent police as against the petitioners.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the second respondent herein gave a complaint to the first respondent on 18.06.2016 by stating that when the second respondent entered into the petitioners house along with her relatives, the petitioners herein thrown them out and threatened like if she gives Rs.5,00,000/- only we will allow her inside otherwise we would kill her and her family also.

3.The learned Counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners are an innocent persons and they have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. Without any base, the first respondent police has registered a case in Crime



No.26 of 2016 for the offences under Sections 498(A), 406 and 506(i) IPC, as against the petitioners. Hence he prayed to quash the same.

4.The learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) would submit that the investigation is almost completed and the respondent police have only to file final report.

5.Heard Mr.G.Ganeshkumar, learned counsel appearing for the petitioners and Mr.R.Erottuchamy, learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the first respondent.

6.It is seen from the First Information Report that there are specific allegations as against the petitioner to attract the offences, which has to be investigated. Further the FIR is not an encyclopedia and it need not 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.

7.It is relevant to rely upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India passed in **Crl.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."

8. In view of the above discussion, this Court is not inclined to quash the First Information Report. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed. However, considering the crime is of the year 2016, the first respondent is directed to complete the investigation in Crime No.26 of 2016 and file a final report within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of copy of this order, before the jurisdiction Magistrate, if not already filed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CSIII)

// True Copy //

/ /2020

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)



1.The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Tallakulam, Madurai District.

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

CRL. O.P (MD) .No.21890 of 2016
and
Crl.M.P (MD) No.11291 of 2016
29.10.2020

CK (CO)
KB (09.11.2020) 4P 3C