



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 26.11.2020

CORAM:

WEB COPY

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

Crl.O.P. (MD)Nos.22559 and 22687 of 2016

and

Crl.MP (MD)No.11867 of 2016

in

Crl.O.P. (MD)No.22687 of 2016

1.Meenakshi

2.Babu

3.Raja Mohammed

... Petitioners/Accused 1 to 3 in
(both Crl.O.Ps)

Vs

State represented by

The Inspector of Police,

Karuppayurani Police Station,

Madurai District.

... 1st Respondent/Complainant in
(Crime No.255 and 256 of 2016) (both Crl.O.Ps)

Ramalakshmi

... 2nd Respondent/Defacto Complainant
in Crl.O.P. (MD)No.22559 of 2016

Mani

... 2nd Respondent/Defacto Complainant
in Crl.O.P. (MD)No.22687 of 2016

Common Prayer:Criminal Original Petitions filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. to call for records relating to the records relating to FIR in Crime Nos.255 and 256 of 2016 dated 17.10.2016 respectively, on the file of the Inspector of Police, Karuppayurani Police Station, Madurai and quash the same as against the petitioners.

(in both Crl.O.Ps)

For Petitioners : Mr.D.Rameshkumar
(both Crl.O.Ps)

For R1 : Mr.K.Suyambulinga Bharathi,
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)
(both Crl.O.Ps)

For R2 : Mr.C.K.M.Appaji
(in both Crl.O.Ps)



COMMON ORDER

These petitions have been filed to quash the F.I.R. in Crime Nos.255 and 256 of 2016 registered by the first respondent police for offences under Sections 406 & 420 of IPC, 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 third respondent police registered a case in rime Nos.255 and 256 of 2016 for the offences under Sections 406 & 420 of IPC, as against the petitioners. Hence he prayed to quash the same.

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

4. Heard Mr.D.Rameshkumar, learned counsel appearing for the petitioners, Mr.K.Suyambulinga Bharathi, learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the first respondent in both Crl.OPs and Mr.C.K.M.Appaji, learned counsel appearing for the second respondent in both Crl.OPs.

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 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.

6. 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.

WEB COPY

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, these Criminal Original Petitions stand dismissed. However, considering the crime is of the year 2016, the first respondent is directed to complete



the investigation in Crime Nos.255 and 256 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.

WEB COPY

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CRL SIDE)

// True Copy //

/ /2021

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

dss

Note: In view of the present lock down owing to COVID-19 pandemic, a web copy of the order may be utilized for official purposes, but, ensuring that the copy of the order that is presented is the correct copy, shall be the responsibility of the advocate/litigant concerned.

To

- 1.The Inspector of Police,
Karuppayurani Police Station,
Madurai District.
- 2.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

Crl.O.P. (MD) Nos.22559 and 22687 of 2016
and
Crl.MP (MD) No.11867 of 2016
in
Crl.O.P. (MD) No.22687 of 2016
26.11.2020

VB (16.02.2021) 4P 3C