



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 03.11.2020

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE **G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN**

CrI.O.P.(MD)No.22531 of 2016

and

CrI.M.P.(MD)No.11748 of 2016

S.Kalil Rahuman

...Petitioner/Accused No.4

Vs.

State Rep. through
The Forest Range Officer,
Kannivadi Forest Range,
Dindigul District.

... Respondent /Complainant

Prayer: Criminal Original petition filed under Section 482 of Code of Criminal Procedure, to call for the records pertaining to the W.L.O.R.No.1/2016, on the file of the Forest Range Officer, Kannivadi Range, Dindigul District and quash the same.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Sheik Abdullah

For Respondent : Ms.M.Ananthadevi
Government Advocate (CrI.side)

O R D E R

This petition has been filed to quash the proceedings in W.L.O.R.No.1 of 2016, on the file of the Forest Range Officer, Kannivadi Range, Dindigul District, as against the petitioners.

2.The case of the prosecution is that on 15.06.2016 the petitioner and four others attempted to sale the 40 years old Tiger's Rug (skin) taxidermy tiger Rug. The petitioner and five others were got red handed by the respondent police on 17.06.2016 at about 1.00 p.m. after receiving a secret information from some reliable sources. Among the six accused one escaped from the eyes of the respondent after left his two wheeler. In this regard, the petitioner was arrested by the respondent and remanded by the learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Dindigul, subsequently, the petitioner was released on bail on 23.06.2016 in Cr.M.P.No.2728 of 2016.

3.The learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is an innocent person and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. Without any base, the respondent police has registered a case in W.L.O.R.No.1 of 2016 for the offence under Sections 40(1) (2) 2(A), 44(1), 49(A), 49(B) and 51(1) of Wild Life Protection Act, 1972, as against the petitioner. 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 a final report.

WEB COPY

5.Heard Mr.M.Sheik Abdullah, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and Ms.M.Ananthadevi, learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) appearing for the 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 respondent is directed to complete the investigation in W.L.O.R.No.1 of 2016 and file a final report within a period of six 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

// True Copy //

/ /2020

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

vsd

<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/>



To

1.The Chief Judicial Magistrate, Dindigul District.
(For circulating Copy to Jurisdictional Magistrate)

2.The Forest Range Officer,
Kannivadi Forest Range,
Dindigul District.

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

Crl.O.P. (MD) No.22531 of 2016
and
Crl.M.P. (MD) No.11748 of 2016

03.11.2020

PU(CO)
NR (04/12/2020) 4P : 4C