



WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED:13.06.2022

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE Mr.JUSTICE G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN

CRL.O.P.No.12735 of 2017

and

CRL.MP.No.8295 of 2017

1.Ganesan
2.Kuppan
3.Ramani

... Petitioners/A1 to A3

Vs

1. State Rep by its
The Inspector of Police
Adhiyamankottai Police Station,
Dharmapuri District,
Cr.No.320 of 2016.

2. Mariyappan

....Respondents

(R2 is impleaded as per order in
Crl.MP.No.17734/2017 in
Crl.O.P.No.12735/2017 dated 05.12.2019)

PRAYER:

Criminal Original Petitions filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C, praying to call for the records relating to the complaint in C.C.No.21 of 2017 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate No.II, Dharmapuri and quash the same as far as the petitioners are concerned.

For Petitioners : Mr.V.Sakkarapani

For Respondents : Mr.A. Gopinath for R1
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)
Mr.A. Ilaya Perumal for R2

ORDER

This petition has been filed to quash the proceedings in in C.C.No.21 of 2017 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate No.II, Dharmapuri, thereby taken cognizance for the offences under Sections 294(b), 324 and 506(ii) of IPC and altered into Sections 294(b), 323, 324, 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.320 of 2016 as against these petitioners.



2. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant purchased two cows from one Kuppan for a sum of Rs.30,000/- for which he paid an advance amount of Rs.25,000/- and agreed to pay the balance amount of Rs.5000/- later. Since the said Kuppan stated that he has sold the cows for another persons, the defacto complainant demanded to repay the advance amount or else he will pay the balance amount for purchase of cows. The said Kuppan refused for the same and involved in a wordy quarrel with the defacto complainant and other petitioners also attacked the defacto complainant with the deadly weapons in which he sustained grievous injuries and also threatened him with dire consequences.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners are innocent and they have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. Without any base, the first respondent police registered a case in Crime No.320 of 2016 for the offences under Sections 294(b), 324 and 506(ii) of IPC and altered into Sections 294(b), 323, 324, 506 (ii) of IPC, as against these petitioners and the same has been taken cognizance in C.C.No.21 of 2017 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate No.II, Dharmapuri. Hence, they prayed to quash the same.

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

5. Heard Mr.V.Sakkarapani, learned counsel appearing for the petitioners and Mr.A.Gopinath, learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the first respondent and Mr.A. Ilaya Perumal, learned counsel appearing for the second respondent.

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



WEB COPY

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 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 CrI.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 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 CrI.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



WEB COPY

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 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 petitioners cannot be considered by this Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C.

9. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and that the petitioners and defacto complainant are close relatives, the occurrence for two complaints are one and the same and also the trial court is one and same in this case and in CrI.OP.No.15221 of 2022, the trial court is directed to take up the cases and complete the trial jointly.

10. In view of the above discussion, this Court is not inclined to quash the proceedings in C.C.No.21 of 2017 in Crime No.320 of 2016 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate No.II, Dharmapuri. The petitioners are at liberty to raise all the grounds before the Trial Court. Considering the age of the petitioners, the personal appearance of the petitioners is dispensed with and they shall be represented by a counsel after filing appropriate application. However, the petitioners shall present before the Court at the time of furnishing of copies, framing charges, questioning under Section 313 Cr.P.C. and at the time of passing judgment. The Trial Court is directed to complete the trial within a period of six months from the date of receipt of copy of this Order.



11. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is also closed.

WEB COPY

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CS IV)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

gv

To

1. The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Dharmapuri.
2. The Inspector of Police
Adhiyamankottai Police Station,
Dharmapuri District,
3. The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court,
Madras.

+1cc to Mr.V.Sakkarapani, Advocate, S.R.No.34695

CRL.O.P.No.12735 of 2017
and
CRL.MP.No.8295 of 2017

KV(CO)
CT/05/07/2022