



Crl.OP.No.22055 of 2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED 15.09.2022

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE Mr.JUSTICE G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN

Crl.O.P.No.22055 of 2022

and

Crl.MP.No.14216 and 14217 of 2022

Uma Maheshwari

... Petitioner

Vs

1. State represent by
Inspector of Police,
R-8, Vadapalani Police Station,
Chennai City.
(Crime No.62/2021)

2. J.Andal

... Respondents

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C, praying to call for the records pertaining to the final report/charge sheet filed by the 1st respondent pending on the file of the learned 17th Metropolitan Magistrate Court, Saidapet, Chennai in CC.No.1980 of 2022 and quash the same.



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.22055 of 2022

For Petitioner : Mr.D.Ravi Kumar

For Respondents : Mr.S.Santhosh
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)
for R1

ORDER

This petition has been filed to quash the proceedings in C.C.No.1980 of 2022 on the file of the learned 17th Metropolitan Magistrate Court, Saidapet, Chennai, thereby taken cognizance for the offences under Sections 294(b), 323 and 506(1) of IPC in Crime No.62 of 2021, as against this petitioner.

2. The case of the prosecution as per the defacto complainant is that the petitioner is the daughter of the defacto complainant. There was a civil dispute between them regarding partition, due to which, the petitioner abused her mother/defacto complainant and brother, assaulted them, threatened them with dire consequences and caused injuries to them. Hence, the complaint.



Crl.OP.No.22055 of 2022

WEB COPY

3. The learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is innocent and she has not committed any such offence as alleged by the prosecution. Without any base, the first respondent police registered a case in Crime No.62 of 2021 for the offences under Sections 294(b), 323 and 506(1) of IPC, as against the petitioner and the same has been taken cognizance in C.C.No. 1980 of 2020 on the file of the learned 17th Metropolitan Magistrate Court, Saidapet, Chennai. He would further submit that it is a case and case in counter. Hence he prayed to quash the same.

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

5. Heard Mr.D.Ravi Kumar, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and Mr.S.Santhosh, learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the first respondent.



Crl.OP.No.22055 of 2022

WEB COPY

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 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



Crl.OP.No.22055 of 2022

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



Crl.OP.No.22055 of 2022

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 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



Crl.OP.No.22055 of 2022

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. 1980 of 2022 in Crime No.62 of 2021 on the file of the 17th Metropolitan Magistrate Court, Saidapet, Chennai. The petitioner is at liberty to raise all the grounds before the trial Court. The personal appearance of the petitioner is dispensed with. The trial



Crl.OP.No.22055 of 2022

WEB COPY

Court is directed to complete the trial within a period of six months from the date of receipt of copy of this Order.

10. Accordingly, this criminal original petition is dismissed.

Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

15.09.2022

Internet: Yes

Index: Yes/no

Vv

To

1. The 17th Metropolitan Magistrate Court,
Saidapet, Chennai
2. The Inspector of Police,
R-8, Vadapalani Police Station,
Chennai City.
3. The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court,
Chennai.



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.22055 of 2022

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN. J.

Vv

**Crl.O.P.No.22055 of 2022
and
Crl.MP.No.14216 and 14217 of 2022**

15.09.2022