



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 11.03.2022

CORAM

WEB COPY

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN

Crl.O.P(MD)No.4678 of 2022

and

Crl.M.P(MD)No.3305 & 3307 of 2022

Rajarathinam

... Petitioner/
Accused No.7

Vs.

1.The State represented by
The Inspector of Police,
District Crime Branch,
Dindigul District.
(Crime No.96 of 2014)

... 1st Respondent/
Complainant

2.Karthikeyan

... 2nd Respondent/
Defacto Complainant

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C., to call for the records relating to impugned charge sheet in C.C.No.498 of 2017 pending on the file of the Judicial Magistrate No.II, Dindigul and quash the same.

For Petitioner	: Mr.T.Palanisamy
For Respondents	: Mr.R.M.Anbunithi
	Additional Public Prosecutor
	(Criminal Side)
	for R.1

ORDER

This petition has been filed to quash the proceedings in C.C.No.498 of 2017 pending on the file of the Judicial Magistrate No.II, Dindigul.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the second respondent is the owner of the property comprised in old Survey No.686, Town Survey No.3/2, ward block No.2, for an extent of 2 acres situated at Kodaikanal Town, Dindigul District was originally belongs to one Rajammal and the principals of the second respondent purchased the entire 2 acres through registered sale deeds, but the first



petitioner also sold 1 acre land through the third petitioner by creating forged documents with the help of the other accused persons and obtained patta in respected of the above said land, as if, she was the owner of the property. Hence, the second respondent lodged this present complaint before the first respondent police. Thereafter the respondent police conducted the investigation and filed the final report before the Judicial Magistrate No.II, Dindigul and the same was numbered as C.C.No.498 of 2017.

3. The learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner 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.96 of 2014 for the offences under Sections 419, 420, 465, 468, 471 r/w 120 (b) IPC, as against the petitioner and the same has been taken cognizance in C.C.No.498 of 2017 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Dindigul. Hence he prayed to quash the same.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor would submit that the trial has been commenced and some of the witnesses have been examined in this case.

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

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 counsels 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 petitioner 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 C.C.No.498 of 2017 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Dindigul. The petitioners is at liberty to raise all the grounds before the trial Court. However, the personal appearance of the petitioner is dispensed with and he shall be represented by a counsel after filing appropriate application. However, the petitioner shall be present before the Court at the time of furnishing of copies, framing charges, questioning under Section 313 Cr.P.C. and at the time of passing judgment.

10. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed. Consequently, the Crl.M.P(MD)No.3307 of 2022 is allowed and Crl.M.P (MD)No.3305 of 2022 is closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (AE)

// 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 Magistrate No.II,
Dindigul.



2.The Inspector of Police,
District Crime Branch,
Dindigul District.

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

+1 CC to M/s.T.PALANISAMY, Advocate (SR-11643[F] dated 11/03/2022)
Crl.O.P(MD)No.4678 of 2022
11.03.2022

MGJ(05.04.2022) 5P 5C