



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 28.02.2022

CORAM

WEB COPY

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN

Crl.O.P(MD)No.3159 of 2022

1.G.Kannan
2.Ganesan
3.Rajalakshmi

... Petitioners/
Accused Nos.1 to 3

Vs.

1.The Inspector of Police
All Women Police Station,
Manamadurai,
Sivagangai District.
(Crime No.5 of 2021)

... 1st Respondent/
Complainant

2.Shanmugapriya

... 2nd Respondent/
Defacto Complainant

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C., to call for the records pertaining to the case in Crime No.5 of 2021 under Section 417, 406, 376 and 506(1) IPC and Section 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 pending investigation on the file of the first respondent police and quash the same.


For Petitioners	: Mr.M.Mohamed Shrebudeen
For Respondents	: Mr.B.Thanga Aravindh Government Advocate(Crl.Side) for R.1

Mr.L.Alagusundaram for R.2

ORDER

The Criminal Original Petition has been filed to quash the FIR as against the petitioners /Accused Nos.1 to 3 in Crime No.5 of 2021 on the file of the first respondent for the alleged offences under Sections 417, 406, 376 and 506(1) IPC and Section 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant and the first petitioner were loved each other for the past 6 years and the first petitioner assured to marry the defacto complainant. The first petitioner is working as police. On 18.09.2019, the first



petitioner gave a false promise to marry the defacto complainant and had intercourse with the defacto complainant at about 10.00 p.m and thereafter, also the first petitioner had sexual intercourse with the defacto complainant on several occasion. But the first petitioner refused to marry the defacto complainant and on 29.05.2021 the defacto complainant met the petitioners 2 and 3 and they abused the defacto complainant and further demanded 80 sovereigns of gold for marriage and threatened the defacto complainant with dire consequences, she lodged a complaint.

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.5 of 2021 for the offences under Sections 417, 406, 376 and 506(1) IPC and Section 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 as against the petitioners.

4.The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) would submit that the investigation is almost completed and the respondent police are about to file the final report before the concerned court.

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

6.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.

7.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.**, 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.

WEB COPY

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."

8. 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 police is

<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/>



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

9. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (As)

// True Copy //

/ /2022

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

mga

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,
All Women Police Station,
Manamadurai,
Sivagangai District.
2. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

Crl.O.P(MD)No.3159 of 2022
28.02.2022

MGJ(05.04.2022) 4P 3C