



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 07.02.2022

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.542 of 2022

and

Crl.M.P(MD)No.421 of 2022

1.G.Rajendhran

2.G.R.Ananthapadmanapan

3.G.R.Radhakrishnan

... Petitioners/Accused Nos.1 to 3

Vs.

1.The State represented by,
The Inspector of Police,
Anti-Land Grabbing Cell,
District Crime Branch,
Thoothukudi District.

... 1st Respondent/Complainant

2.Vellaisamy

... 2nd Respondent/
Defacto Complainant

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C., to call for the records in Crime No.26 of 2021, dated 31.08.2021, on the file of the first respondent and quash the same as illegal as against the petitioners concerned.

For Petitioners : Mr.A.Muralikumar


For R - 1 : Mr.B.Thanga Aravind
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

For R - 2 : Mr.S.Saravanan

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed to quash the proceedings in Crime No.26 of 2021 on the file of the first respondent.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioners fraudulently obtained the lands belonging to the defacto complainant and his brother Katturaja, measuring an extent of 3.90 acres. Further, it is also alleged in the complaint that the fifth accused had forged the Aadhar card of both the defacto complainant and his brother Katturaja by defacing their image with the image of the



sixth and seventh accused in ID proofs and with that forged ID proofs, the fifth accused registered a power of attorney bearing Document No.1233 of 2020, dated 21.08.2020, in his favour by impersonating the sixth and seventh accused as defacto complainant and his brother. Subsequently, the fifth accused executed a sale deed in Document No.1318 of 2020, dated 02.09.2020 in favour of the petitioners' Company. For the execution of power of attorney, dated 21.08.2020, one Kanagaraj, the eighth accused and one Thangavel Nadar, the ninth accused had witnessed it and for the sale deed, dated 02.09.2020, one Balu, the tenth accused and one Manikandan, the eleventh accused had witnessed it. It is also alleged in the complaint that the subject fraudulent sale was executed by the fifth accused conspiring with one Perumal, the fourth accused, the authorized signatory of the petitioner's Company under the instructions of the present petitioners. Hence, the complaint.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the defacto complainant has deliberately twisted the facts and gave a false complaint against the petitioners.

4. Heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.

5. It is seen from the First Information Report that there are specific allegation as against the petitioners, which has to be investigated. Further the FIR is not an encyclopedia and it need not contain all facts. Further, it 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.

6. It is also 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 - Sau. Kamal Shivaji Pokarnekhar 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.


6.....

7.....

8.....

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 Courts 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."

7. In view of the above discussion, this Court is not inclined to quash the First Information Report. Hence this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed. However, the respondent police is



directed to complete the investigation and file a final report before the concerned Magistrate, within a period of twelve weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this Order. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (W)

WEB COPY

// True Copy //

/ /2022

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

ps

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 Inspector of Police,
Anti-Land Grabbing Cell,
District Crime Branch,
Thoothukudi District.
- 2.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

Crl.O.P(MD)No.542 of 2022
07.02.2022

CK(CO)
KB(18.02.2022) 4P 3C