



WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 10.06.2021

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE Mr.JUSTICE G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN

Crl.O.P.No.10131 of 2021

and

Crl.M.P.Nos.6152 and 6153 of 2021

Albert @ Albert Rajkumar

... Petitioner

Vs

1. State,
Represented by the Sub-Inspector of Police (L&O),
K-4, Anna Nagar Police Station, Chennai - 600 040.

2. Ilavarasi

... Respondents

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C, to call for the records in C.C.No.5 of 2021 on the file of the Additional Mahila Court, Egmore, Chennai initiated by the 1st respondent against the petitioner and quash the same.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Anishkumar

For Respondents : Mr.A.Damodaran
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)
(for R-1)

O R D E R

This petition has been filed to quash the proceedings in C.C.No.5 of 2021 on the file of the Additional Mahila Court, Egmore, Chennai, thereby taken cognizance for the offences under Sections 341, 294(b), 323 of IPC r/w. Section 4 of the Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act, 1998, in Crime No.673 of 2019, as against this petitioner.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the 2nd respondent/de-facto complainant is hired as a Watchwomen from a Security Agency for a ladies Hostel running at I & II Floor of Sundaram Apartment, Door No.178, Y Block, First Street, Anna Nagar, Chennai. While, the 2nd respondent/de-facto complainant was going to the first floor for signing in attendance register, the petitioner/accused, who is the brother of Beula Rajkumari



and occupant of ground floor flat intercepted her to reach first floor. While she was returning to the ground floor with chairs, the petitioner/accused had pulled the chair to his house side and the 2nd respondent/de-facto complainant pulled the chair in her side. During that scuffle, the petitioner /accused has loudly asked the 2nd respondent/de-facto complainant to leave the chairs and also punched on the face of the 2nd respondent/de-facto complainant. Due to that, there was a bleeding in the 2nd respondent/de-facto complainant's nose and mouth and she suffered injuries. Thereafter, when the 2nd respondent/de-facto complainant was sitting in the Car Parking, the petitioner/accused had twisted the hand of the 2nd respondent/de-facto complainant. Thereafter, the co-worker one Menaka informed the above incident over phone and then the staff of the security agency took the 2nd respondent/de-facto complainant to the Hospital. Hence the complaint.

3. The learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. Without any base, the first respondent police registered a case in Crime No.673 of 2019 for the offences under Sections 341, 294(b), 323 of IPC r/w. Section 4 of the Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act, 1998, as against the petitioner and the same has been taken cognizance in C.C.No.5 of 2021 on the file of the Additional Mahila Court, Egmore, Chennai. Hence he prayed to quash the same.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) would submit that the trial has been commenced and some of the witnesses have been examined in this case.

5. Heard Mr.R.Anishkumar, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr.A.Damodaran, learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the first respondent.

6. 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



WEB COPY

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.

7. 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."

8. 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



WEB COPY

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.

.....

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.

9. In view of the above discussion, this Court is not inclined to quash the proceedings in C.C.No.5 of 2021 in Crime No.673 of 2019 on the file of the Additional Mahila Court, Egmore, Chennai. However, the Court below is directed to complete the trial within a period of 12 months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. The petitioner is at liberty to raise all the grounds before the trial Court.

10. Accordingly, this criminal original petition is dismissed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(CS VIII)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

kv



To

1. Additional Mahila Court,
Egmore, Chennai.
2. The Sub-Inspector of Police (L&O),
K-4, Anna Nagar Police Station,
Chennai - 600 040.
3. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.

Crl.O.P.No.10131 of 2021

JPL(CO)
PM(19/07/2021)