



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 06.01.2021

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE Mrs. JUSTICE R. HEMALATHA

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15858 of 2020

and

Crl.M.P(MD)Nos.7769 & 7771 of 2020

WEB COPY

- 1.Chellasamy
- 2.Suryaprasadh
- 3.Balamurugan

... Petitioners/Respondents

Vs.

- 1.The Sub Divisional Magistrate cum
Revenue Divisional Officer,
Kovilpatti,
Thoothukudi District.

... 1st Respondent

- 2.The Inspector of Police,
Kovilpatti West Police Station,
Thoothukudi District.

...2nd Respondent/Complainant

Prayer : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C to call for the records in M.C.A1/564/2020, dated 10.11.2020 pending on the file of the first respondent and quash the same.

For Petitioners : Mr. R.J.Karthick

For Respondents 1 & 2 : Mr.A.Robinson

Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

ORDER

The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C praying to call for the records in M.C.A1/564/2020, dated 10.11.2020 pending on the file of the first respondent and quash the same.

2.The primordial submission of the petitioner is that the impugned proceedings, dated 10.11.2020, under Section 107 Cr.P.C., issued by the first respondent against the petitioner in M.C.A1/564/2020 is illegal and un-sustainable, as it does not state the facts leading to the issuance of the said proceedings.

3.Mr.R.J.Karthick, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner has relied on the decision of the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court in **M.Krishnamurthy Vs. The Sub Divisional Magistrate Cum Revenue Divisional Officer, Krishnagiri and another, reported in 2017 (1) CTC 680**, in which, it has been held thus :

23. In our view, a show cause order under Section 107 r/w 111 can be subjected to judicial review under Section 482 Cr.P.C. or Article 226 of the Constitution of India, if on the face of it, the order does not satisfy the minimum requirements of



Section 111 or that the same has been passed by a person who is not an Executive Magistrate and not otherwise. In other words, if the order does not contain the substance of the information received, the amount of the bond to be executed, the term for which it is to be in force, and the number, character and class of sureties (if any) required, only then, can the High Court interfere and not otherwise. Factual adjudication of the satisfaction expressed by the Magistrate is ruled out in view of the decision of the Supreme Court in *Vicco Laboratories (supra)*."

4.Mr.A.Robinson, learned Government Advocate, who takes notice for the respondents, fairly conceded that the summons issued to the accused persons by the Sub Divisional Magistrate is not inconsonance with the provisions laid down under Section 111 of Cr.P.C. and therefore, the same is liable to be set aside.

5.Considering the said submissions made on either side, the impugned order passed by the Sub Divisional Magistrate Cum Revenue Divisional Officer in M.C.A1/564/2020, dated 10.11.2020, is set aside.

6.Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is allowed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (AS)

// True Copy //

/ /2021

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

rm

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 Sub Divisional Magistrate cum
Revenue Divisional Officer,
Kovilpatti,
Thoothukudi District.

2.The Inspector of Police,
Kovilpatti West Police Station,
Thoothukudi District.



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

+1 CC to M/s.R.J.KARTHICK, Advocate (SR-392[F] dated 07/01/2021)

WEB COPY

CrI.O.P. (MD) No.15858 of 2020
06.01.2021

MK (CO)
KB (20.01.2021) 3P 5C