



CRL.O.P (MD) No.11391 of 2022

.BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 27.06.2022

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.SIVAGNANAM

CRL.O.P (MD) No.11391 of 2022

and

CrI.M.P(MD)No.7188 of 2022

Logeswaran @ Logeshwar

...Petitioner/Accused No.3

Vs.

1.The State Rep. By

The Inspector of Police,
Jayamangalam Police Station,
Theni District.

(In Crime No.56 of 2022)

... 1st Respondent/Complainant

2.Ramesh

... 2nd Respondent/Defacto Complainant

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C., to call for the records relating to the impugned F.I.R. in Crime No.56 of 2022, dated 19.03.2022 on the file of the first respondent police and quash the same as illegal insofar as the petitioner is concerned.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Murugan

For R1 : Mr.E.Antony Sahaya Prabhakar
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

This petition has been filed to quash the FIR in Crime No.56 of 2022, dated 19.03.2022 on the file of the first respondent police.



CRL.O.P (MD) No.11391 of 2022

2.The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that on 18.03.2022 at about 07.30 a.m., when the defacto complainant was in his house along with his family, A1 along with 6 others are said to have questioned about the lodging of complaint before the police and assaulted and also threatened him with dire consequences. Hence, the case has been registered in Crime No.56 of 2022 for the offences punishable under Sections 147, 148, 294(b), 448, 323, 324 and 506(ii) of IPC against the petitioner. On the date itself the counter case has also been registered in Crime Nos.57 of 2022 and 58 of 2022. Both the complaints were investigated and pending. The petitioner is working in Indian Overseas Bank, Theni Government Medical College Branch, Kandamanur Vilakku, Theni District and he is not involved in this case and it is a case in counter. Therefore, he prays for quashing the said F.I.R.

3.The learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent police submitted that there are three complaints with regard to the same occurrence. The alleged occurrence took place on 18.03.2022 at about 7.30 a.m. The case have been registered in Cr.Nos.56 and 57 and 58 of 2022 and investigation is still pending.

4. I have considered the submission of the learned counsel appearing for the petitioners and the learned Government Advocate (criminal side) appearing



for the respondent police.

WEB COPY

5.The Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Indian Oil Corporation vs. NEPC India Limited and others [(2006)6 SCC 736]** laid down the principles relating to exercise of jurisdiction under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure to quash complaints and criminal proceedings, which are relevant for the present purpose are:-

(i) A complaint can be quashed where the allegations made in the complaint, even if they are taken at their face value and accepted in their entirety, do not prima facie constitute any offence or make out the case alleged against the accused.

For this purpose, the complaint has to be examined as a whole, but without examining the merits of the allegations. Neither a detailed inquiry nor a meticulous analysis of the material nor an assessment of the reliability or genuineness of the allegations in the complaint, is warranted while examining prayer for quashing of a complaint.

(ii) A complaint may also be quashed where it is a clear abuse of the process of the court, as when the criminal proceeding is found to have been initiated with malafides/malice for wreaking vengeance or to cause harm, or where the allegations are absurd and inherently improbable.



iii) The power to quash shall not, however, be used to stifle or scuttle a legitimate prosecution. The power should be used sparingly and with abundant caution.

(iv) The complaint is not required to verbatim reproduce the legal ingredients of the offence alleged. If the necessary factual foundation is laid in the complaint, merely on the ground that a few ingredients have not been stated in detail, the proceedings should not be quashed. Quashing of the complaint is warranted only where the complaint is so bereft of even the basic facts which are absolutely necessary for making out the offence.

(v) A given set of facts may make out : (a) purely a civil wrong; or (b) purely a criminal offence; or (c) a civil wrong as also a criminal offence. A commercial transaction or a contractual dispute, apart from furnishing a cause of action for seeking remedy in civil law, may also involve a criminal offence. As the nature and scope of a civil proceedings are different from a criminal proceeding, the mere fact that the complaint relates to a commercial transaction or breach of contract, for which a civil remedy is available or has been availed, is not by itself a ground to quash the criminal proceedings. The test is whether the allegations in the complaint disclose a criminal offence or not.

6. In the case on hand, a perusal of impugned F.I.R., shows that the case

has been registered in Crime No.56 of 2022 for the offences punishable under



CRL.O.P (MD) No.11391 of 2022

Sections 147, 148, 294(b), 448, 323, 324 & 506(ii) IPC. The fact discloses that the occurrence took place on 18.03.2022 at about 7.30 a.m., while the defacto complainant along with his family members was in his house, the petitioners along with 6 others went to the house of the defacto complainant and quarreled with him and also assaulted him with Aruval and stick. Therefore, the fact discloses cognizable offence and further the counter case in Crime Nos.57 and 58 are pending. Since the investigation is pending in all cases, it is inappropriate to quash the F.I.R. in initial stage. Under these circumstances, this Court finds no merit in this petition.

7.On perusal of impugned F.I.R, it is seen that the allegation therein would *prima facie* make out a case for investigation by the police authority.

8.Further, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **R.P.Kapur v. State of Punjab (AIR 1960 SC 866)** and subsequent cases, has held that revisional or inherent powers for quashing the proceedings at the initial stage can be exercised only where the allegations made in the complaint or the first information report, even if taken at their face value and accepted in their entirety, do not *prima facie* disclose the commission of an offence or where the uncontroverted allegations made in the FIR or complaint and the evidence relied in support of the same do not disclose the commission of any offence



CRL.O.P (MD) No.11391 of 2022

against the accused, or the allegations are so absurd and inherently improper that on the basis of which no prudent person could have reached a just conclusion that there were sufficient grounds in proceedings against the accused or where there is an express legal bar engrafted in any provisions of the Code or any other statute to the institution and continuance of the criminal proceedings or where a criminal proceeding is manifestly actuated with mala fide and has been initiated maliciously with the ulterior motive for wrecking vengeance on the accused and with a view to spite him due to private and personal grudge.

9.The Investigating Agency should have the freedom to go into the whole gamut of the allegations and to reach a conclusion of its own. It is not appropriate to quash the complaint since this Court finds no merit in this case.

10.In the light of the above factual and legal positions, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed. Consequently connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

27.06.2022

Internet: Yes
Index: Yes/No
vsd



CRL.O.P (MD) No.11391 of 2022

WEB COPY

To

- 1.The Inspector of Police,
Jayamangalam Police Station,
Theni District.
- 2.Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



CRL.O.P (MD) No.11391 of 2022

V.SIVAGNANAM, J.

vsd

CRL.O.P (MD) No.11391 of 2022
and
CrI.M.P(MD)No.7188 of 2022

27.06.2022