



conspiracy. Except the vague allegation, there is no material document to implicate the petitioner. The entire case proceeds against the petitioner only on a presumption and no tangible material is available.

3.The learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) appearing for the first respondent submits that in this case, PW1 the defacto complainant Gandhirajan is running an Oil Industry in the name of Sun Raja Oil Industries. For the purchase of ground nut for processing of oil, the defacto complainant had entrusted a sum of Rs.80,00,000/- to the driver of the Lorry bearing Registration No.TN 28 AH 1282 and on 02.03.2014, when the vehicle was nearing Ulundurpet Bye-pass, the former employees got information from the present employees about the movement of the lorry, way laid by using the Government registration vehicle and taken away the cash of Rs.80,00,000/-. As regards this petitioner, this petitioner is the master mind behind the entire operation. This petitioner along with the other accused viz.,his brother A7 and others have conspired, planned and executed the operations.

4.Further, the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that the petitioner was not present at the scene of occurrence but it is alleged that the petitioner was a party to the conspiracy, who had planned and arranged the other persons in commission of the above offence.

5. Further, the contention of the Government Advocate (Crl.side) is that in this case, only a portion of the amount has been recovered and there are enough materials to show that the petitioner along with the other accused had participated prior and after the occurrence, had shared the amount involved in the dacoity. The petitioner has involved in the offence of similar nature. He further submitted that the petitioner has been absconding himself and with great difficulty, the petitioner was arrested. The offence is said to have taken place in the year 2014. After investigation, charge sheet filed in the year 2015 and the case has been kept pending for the past six years without committal. One of the other accused had been absenting himself and delaying the proceedings and the case has been committed in the Court of Session and taken on file in S.C.No.98 of 2021. Hence, he strongly opposed the petition.

6.Considering the submissions and finding that there are sufficient materials to proceed against the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to entertain the petition. Accordingly, the criminal original petition is dismissed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.



7. Considering that the offence had taken place in the year 2014 and the investigation completed in the year 2015 and committal to be made only in the year 2021, this court finds that there has been inordinate delay. In view of the same, the trial Court is directed to complete the trial and give priority to complete the trial within a period of six months. If any dilatory tactic adopted by any of the accused, the trial court is to take coercive action following the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in P.K.Shaji vs. State of Kerala [(2005)AIR SCW 5560].

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CS-III)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

sms

To

1. The Inspector of Police,
Ulundurpet Police Station,
Villupuram District.
Crime No.74 of 2014.

2.The Sub-Judge,
The Sub Court, Ulundurpet
Villupuram District

3.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

Cr1.O.P.No.15288 of 2021
and
Cr1.M.P.No.8360 of 2021

SRA(CO)
CB(17/09/2021)