



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 12.04.2022

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN

Crl.O.P. (MD)No.4051 of 2020

and

Crl.M.P (MD)Nos.2250, 2251 & 2252 of 2020

WEB COPY

1.S.R.James

2.Justin James

... Petitioners/Accused Nos.1 & 2

Vs.

1.The State represented by,
The Inspector of Police,
City Crime Branch,
Madurai.

(Crime No.3 of 2019). ... 1st Respondent/Complainant

2.T.K.Ramesh Babu

... 2nd Respondent/Defacto Complainant

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C., to call for the records in Crime No.3 of 2019 on the file of the Inspector of Police, CCB, Madurai and quash the same.

For Petitioners

: Mr.K.P.S.Palanivel Rajan

For R - 1

: Mr.B.Thanga Aravindh

Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

For R - 2

: Mr.H.Lakshmi Shankar

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed to quash the F.I.R in Crime No.3 of 2019 on the file of the first respondent.

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 03.06.2018, the second respondent had requested the first petitioner to supply goods for a sum Rs.39,10,383/- in favour of Shri Sapthagiri Associate and for a sum of Rs.24,03,821/- in favour of Shri Kamatchi Traders. The petitioners said to have promised to deliver the goods by 05.07.2018 and also informed that they would collect the payment on 05.07.2018. On 05.07.2018, the petitioners approached the second respondent and stated that the goods would be delivered in person and insisted for the payment of Rs.63,14,204/- in respect of both concerns. The second respondent had transferred the same by RTGS on the same day, but, however, at 02.00 p.m., the petitioners had informed that he could not deliver the goods, as they were handed over to another dealer and promised to supply within two days. As the second respondent did not agree, he demanded repayment and as a result, the first petitioner had handed over three cheques totalling a sum of Rs.63,14,204/-. As payment had been stopped by the petitioners, the present complaint has been preferred against the petitioners. Based



on the said complaint, F.I.R has been registered against the petitioners in Crime No.3 of 2019 for the offences under Sections 120(b), 406 and 420 of I.P.C.

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

4. On a perusal of the materials available on record, it is seen that already the petitioners filed a quash petition before this Court to quash the F.I.R in Crime No.3 of 2019 in Crl.O.P(MD)No.8476 of 2019 and this Court, by an order dated 13.11.2019, dismissed the quash petition and as requested by the learned counsel for the petitioners, directed the first respondent to complete the investigation and file a final report within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of the copy of that order. However, the first respondent failed to file any final report even till today.

5. Further, it is seen from the First Information Report that there are specific allegations as against the petitioners, which have 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 Pokarnekar vs. the State of Maharashtra & ors.***, wherein the Honourable Supreme Court of India has held 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 first respondent is directed to complete the investigation and file a final report before the concerned Magistrate, within a period of four weeks from the date of



receipt of a copy of this order. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petitions are closed.

WEB COPY

// True Copy //

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CrI.Side)

/ /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,
City Crime Branch,
Madurai.
- 2.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

+1 CC to M/s.H. LAKSHMI SHANKAR, Advocate (SR-18505[F]
dated 13/04/2022)

Order made in
CrI.O.P (MD)No.4051 of 2020
12.04.2022

KG (CO)
GC (27.04.2022) 4P 4C