



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT
DATED: 25.02.2022

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE **G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN**

Crl.O.P.(MD) No.3847 of 2022
and Crl.M.P(MD) No.2817 of 2022

Muthuvairavan

...Petitioner/Accused 4

Vs.

1. The State Rep by
The Inspector of Police
Ammayanaickanur Police Station
Dindigul District

...Respondent/Complainant

2. Thangapandiammal

...Respondent/
Defacto Complainant

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. praying to call for the records pertaining to Crime No.686 of 2021 on the file of the 1st respondent and so for as accused No.4 quash the same with regard to the petitioner.

For Petitioner : M/s.N.Mohamed Ayyadurai
For Respondents : Mr.R.M.Anbunithi
No.1 Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed to quash the proceedings in Crime No.686 of 2021 on the file of the first respondent police.

2. The Case of the prosecution is the 2nd respondent family and the petitioner's father were having some money disputes between the parties, due to which a case is pending before the Court. The 2nd respondent/defacto complainant's husband namely palanisamy, van driver Ramkrishnan, Jegadeesan, Kannusamy went to pallapatty for collecting the money, at the time there arose a dispute in which the petitioner along with other accuses said to have abused the defacto complainant, assaulted and also threatened with dire consequences. After incident the 2nd respondent given a complaint on 04.11.2021 before the 1st respondent and the same was registered in Cr.No.686/2021 for offence u/s. 323, 354, 506(i) of I.P.C and 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act.

3. The learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor would submit that
<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/>



the investigation is 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:

WEB COPY

6. It is seen from the First Information Report that there are specific allegation as against the petitioner, 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 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



WEB COPY

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 respondent police is directed to complete the investigation and file 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 (T&P)

// True Copy //

/ /2022

Sub Assistant Registrar (CS)

aav



To

1. The Judicial Magistrate, Dindigul.

2. The Inspector of Police
Ammayanaickanur Police Station
Dindigul District

3. The Additional Public Prosecutor
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court
Madurai.

Crl.O.P. (MD) No.3847 of 2022
25.02.2022

SRR (CO)
KB (09.03.2022) 4P 4C