



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 16.03.2022

CORAM:

WEB COPY

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

Crl.O.P.(MD) No.4911 of 2022

and

Crl.M.P(MD) No.3478 of 2022

T.Saravanan

...Petitioner/13th Accused

Vs.

1. The State rep its

The Inspector of Police,
Thottiyam Police Station,
Tiruchirapalli District.
(Crime No. 353 of 2021)

... 1st Respondent/Complainant

2. Muralimohan

...2nd Respondent/Defacto Complainant

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. praying to call for the records relating to the proceedings in Crime No.353 of 2021, dt.04.11.2021 on the file of R1 Police and quash the same in so far as the petitioner/Accused 13 is Concerned.

For Petitioner	:	Mr.K.R.Kishore Ram
For Respondents	:	Mr.R.M.Anbunithi
No.1 & 2		Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed to quash the proceedings in Crime No. 353 of 2021 on the file of the first respondent police.

2. The defacto complainant is the Head Constable of the respondent police station. When he along with other police personnel were in patrol duty in the patrol vehicle bearing Reg. No. TN 45 G 1348 inspecting the scene of occurrence and on information that there was a communal clash between people in Kolakudi Village, enquiring the accused regarding the issue, some of the accused were blocking the road and was firing crackers, in which both of them started attacking each other with stones. During the occurrence the wind shield of vehicle of the respondent police



got damaged. With the above allegations, the respondent police registered the above FIR.

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. He would further submit that only on the information given by the petitioner to the existing Village Administrative Officer, the present complaint has been registered in Crime No.353 of 2021. Unfortunately the petitioner is also added as accused.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor would submit that 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.

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. On perusal of the First Information Report, the name of the petitioner found place as second accused and there are specific allegations as against the petitioner. At this juncture, 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 it is 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."

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 get evidence if any available from the petitioner and



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 (Crl.Side)

// True Copy //

/ /2022

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

aav

To

1.The Inspector of Police,
Thottiyam Police Station,
Tiruchirapalli District.

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

Crl.O.P.(MD) No.4911 of 2022

and

Crl.M.P(MD) No.3478 of 2022

16.03.2022

nsn(CO)

GC(28.03.2022) 4P 3C