



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 10.02.2022

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.2864 of 2022

and

Crl.M.P(MD) Nos.2148 and 2149 of 2022

1. Murugesan

2. Selvaraj

... Petitioners/A5 & A6

Vs

1. State

Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
Alangudi Police Station,
Pudukkottai District.

... 1st Respondent/Complainant

2. Annasamy

... 2nd Respondent/
Defacto Complainant

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. to call for the records relating to P.R.C.No.15 of 2021 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate Court, Alangudi, Pudukkottai District, and quash the same.


For Petitioners : Mr.S.Vimalraj

For Respondent : Mr.R.M.Anbunithi
No.1 Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed to call for the records relating to P.R.C.No.15 of 2021 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate Court, Alangudi, Pudukkottai District, and quash the same.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant married the sister of the first accused namely Anitha on 13.06.2019. There is a mis understanding between the defacto complainant and his wife. Due to such motive, on the date of occurrence all the accused persons unlawfully assembled with deadly weapons, abused the defacto complainant in filthy language, assaulted and caused simple injuries. Hence the 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 and the cases are imaginary.. Without any base, the first respondent police registered a case in Crime No. 484 of 2020 for the offences under Sections 341,294(b),323,324,506(ii) ,147, 148 and 307 of IPC, as against the petitioners and the same has been taken cognizance in PRC No.15 of 2021 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Alangudi, Pudukottai District Hence he prayed to quash the same.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor would submit that the trial has been commenced.

5. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioners and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the first 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 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 **Crl.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 counsel 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 **Crl.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 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. In view of the above discussion, this Court is not inclined to quash the proceedings in PRC No.15 of 2021 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Alangudi, Pudukottai District.



10. Accordingly, this criminal original petition is dismissed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are also closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (AS)

// True Copy //

/ /2022

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

aav

To

1. The Judicial Magistrate,
Alangudi, Pudukottai District.
2. The Inspector of Police,
Alangudi Police Station,
Pudukkottai District.
3. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

+1 CC to M/s.D.RAMESH KUMAR, Advocate (SR-6024[F] dated 14/02/2022)

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.2864 of 2022

10.02.2022

USK/23.02.2022/4P/5C