

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS
DATED : 22.02.2021
CORAM
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE N. ANAND VENKATESH
Crl.O.P No.8673 of 2020

Pattu Arun ... Petitioners/Accused 1
vs.

1. The State Tamil Nadu rep by:
The Sub -Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch,
EDF-1, Team IV,
Vepery, Chennai 600 007.
(Crime No.601/2013) ... 1st Respondent/complainant
2. Soundarapandian ... 2nd Respondent/
Defacto complainant

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, to call for the records in C.C.No.1125 of 2015 on the file of the learned XI Metropolitan Magistrate, Saidapet, Chennai and quash the same.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Shankar
For Respondents: Mr.C.Raghavan
Government Advocate, for R1

ORDER

This petition has been filed to quash the proceedings in C.C.No.1125 of 2015 on the file of the learned XI Metropolitan Magistrate, Saidapet, Chennai.

2. Heard Mr.S.Shankar, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and Mr.C.Raghavan, learned Government Advocate appearing for the first respondent.

3. This Court while considering the quash petition filed by A3 in Crl OP No.4557 of 2017, dealt with the entire issue in detail. Therefore, it will be more beneficial to extract the order hereunder:

"2. Based on the complaint given by the 2nd respondent, the respondent police registered an FIR in Crime No.601 of 2013 for an offence under Sections 406 and 420 of IPC. On the completion of the investigation, a final report was filed before the Court below

and the same has been taken on file in C.C.No.1125 of 2015 as against three accused persons for an offence under Sections 406, 420 r/w 34 and 120(b) of IPC. The petitioner has been added as A3.

3.The case of the prosecution is that the son of the petitioner namely, A1 had received a sum of Rs.28,00,000/- from the defacto complainant and this amount was paid on the assurance given by the petitioner and her husband, that it will be returned back. This amount was paid for the purpose of producing a movie by A1. Subsequently another sum of Rs.2,00,000/- has been paid to A1. The cheque that was issued by A1 was also dishonored with an endorsement "stop payment"?. Therefore, according to the defacto complainant, he has been cheated and all the accused persons conspired together and misappropriated the amount.

4.The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that even if the final report is taken as it is, along with the materials relied upon by the prosecution, no offence of breach of trust or cheating has been made out against the petitioner. The learned counsel submitted that the simple case of the prosecution is that money was paid by the defacto complainant to A1 on the assurance given by his parents and the amount has not been repaid. These allegations, according to the learned counsel for the petitioner, does not make out an offence of criminal breach of trust and cheating.

5.The learned Additional Public Prosecutor submitted that the respondent police have investigated the case and filed a final report and the statement recorded from the defacto complainant and LW2 to LW5, clearly makes out a prima facie case of breach of trust and cheating. The learned counsel submitted that this Court should not interfere with the proceedings at this stage and the accused persons must be made to face the trial before the Court below.

6.This Court carefully considered the submissions made on either side and the materials available on record.

7.The private notice that was sent to the 2nd respondent has been returned as ? information delivered?. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in J.K.International vs. State (Govt. of NCT of Delhi) And and others reported in (2001) 3 SCC 462 has categorically held that it is not necessary in all cases to hear the defacto complainant, while dealing with quash proceedings at the stage of final report and he can be effectively represented by the Public Prosecutor appearing on behalf of the State. The 2nd respondent has not entered appearance in this case and therefore this Court proceeds to decide the case on merits.

8.The case of the prosecution has been extracted supra. It is a clear case of money being lent by the defacto complainant to A1 and the same not being repaid back to him. According to the complainant, the money was given to A1 only on the assurance given by his parents. The petitioner before this Court is the mother of A1.

9.It is now a well settled proposition of law that in order to constitute an offence of cheating, there must be an intention to cheat even at the inception. A culpable intention at the very inception, cannot be presumed on the failure to keep up a promise subsequently. Useful reference can be made to the judgment in T.Chandrasekhar vs. State, rep by Inspector of Police, Central Crime Branch, Land Grabbing, Thousand Light P.S., Chennai-600006 and Another reported in (2011) 3 MLJ (Cr1) 644.

10.This is a clear case which is squarely covered by the above said judgment. A1 had failed to keep up his promise to repay back the amount subsequently. That by itself will not give raise to a presumption that there was a culpable intention at the very inception.

11. In the considered view of this Court, the defacto complainant has given a criminal colour to a pure and simple civil dispute and therefore the proceedings itself is an abuse of process of Court.

4. This Court has categorically held that the failure on the part of A1 to keep up his promise to repay back the amount subsequently, will not attract the offence of cheating. This Court also held that the Defacto Complainant has given a Criminal Colour to a pure and simple civil dispute. The findings of this Court will also enure to the benefit of the petitioner herein.

5. In the result the proceedings in C.C.No.1125 of 2015 on the file of the learned XI Metropolitan Magistrate, Saidapet, Chennai, is hereby quashed and the Criminal Original Petition is allowed.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar (CS IV)

/true copy/

Sub Asst. Registrar

jv
To

1. The XI Metropolitan Magistrate,
Saidapet,
Chennai.
- 2.-do-Thro The Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore
Chennai-08
3. The Sub -Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch,
EDF-1, Team IV,
Vepery, Chennai 600 007.
4. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras,
Chennai 600 104.

+1 cc to M/s.A.Ilayaperumal Advocate sr10918 dt 16/03/2021

Cr1.O.P No.8673 of 2020

aab(co)
aa15/03/2021
aa16/03/2021