

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 20.06.2022

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN

CRL.O.P.NO.16552 OF 2020

AND

CRL.M.P.NO.6380 OF 2020

M.Nagarathina

... Petitioner

.Vs.

1. The State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
SIPCOT P.S.,  
(Crime No.419 of 2019)  
Krishnagiri District.

2. R.Bhuvaneshwari

... Respondents

PRAYER:-

Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. praying to call for the records relating to the FIR in Crime No.419 of 2019 on the file of the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent and quash the same by allowing this Criminal Original Petition.

For Petitioner : Mr.N.Manoharan

For R1 : Mr.A.Gopinath  
Government Advocate  
(Criminal Side)

O R D E R

This petition has been filed to quash the F.I.R. in Crime No.419 of 2019 on the file of the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent for offences under Sections 294(b), 323 and 447 of IPC, as against the petitioner.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent was running Alpha Industries and her husband one Ravikumar (late) was running VSK Engineering works. On 06.10.2019, the

employee of the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent contacted her through telephone and informed about the attempt made by the petitioner and others to dismantle the machineries from her company. It is also alleged that 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent rushed to the place of occurrence and attempted to prevent the petitioner and others. While so, the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent informed the petitioner that her husband had borrowed Rs.10,00,000/- and it was also repaid. Further, it is alleged that the petitioner had scolded the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent in filthy language and also assaulted her. Hence, the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent has lodged a complaint before the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent.

3. The learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. Without any base, the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent police registered a case in Crime No.419 of 2019 for the offences under Sections 294(b), 323 and 447 of IPC, as against the petitioner. Hence, he prayed to quash the same.

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

5. Heard Mr.N.Manoharan, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and Mr.A.Gopinath, learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the first respondent.

6. It is seen from the First Information Report that there are specific allegations as against the petitioner to attract the offences under Sections 294(b), 323 and 447 of IPC. Further, the grounds raised by the petitioner are mixed question of facts and the FIR 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.

7. 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.

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 Cosp/anu 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."

8. In view of the above discussion, this Court is not inclined to quash the First Information Report. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed. However, considering the crime is of the year 2019, the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent is directed to complete the investigation in Crime No.419 of 2019

and file a final report within a period of 12 weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this Order, before the jurisdiction Magistrate. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

Sd/-  
Assistant Registrar(CCC)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

sp/anu

To

1. The Inspector of Police,  
SIPCOT Police Station,  
Krishnagiri District.
2. The Public Prosecutor,  
Madras High Court.

+1cc to Mr.N.Manoharan, Advocate, S.R.No.37388

CRL.O.P.NO.16552 OF 2020

GPL(CO)  
PBS/12/07/2022