



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 14.03.2022

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN

Crl.O.P. (MD)No.8984 of 2020

&

Crl.M.P. (MD)No.4227 of 2020

WEB COPY

1.G.Pandiaraj
2.Kannan

...Petitioners

Vs.

1. State represented by
The Inspector of Police,
Subramaniapuram Police Station,
Madurai City.
(Crime No. 1190 of 2020)

2. Rengasamy

... Respondents

Prayer: This Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C.To call for the records pertaining to Crime No.1190/2020, on the file of the 1st respondent and quash the same as against these petitioners are concerned

For Petitioner : Mr.C.Senthil Murugan

For Respondent : Mr.B.Thanga Aravindh
Government Advocate (Criminal Side)

ORDER

This petition has been filed to quash the proceedings in Crime No.1190 of 2020, on the file of the 1st respondent police.

2.The case of the prosecution is that due to property dispute, civil suit was pending between the parties. Due to that, on 25.05.2020, at about 11.00PM, the accused persons criminally trespassed into the subject property and indulged in the occurrence.

3.It is seen from the records that there is civil dispute pending between the deceased second respondent and his sister. In fact, the complaint lodged by the brother of the second respondent, the FIR has been registered, as against son of the second respondent in crime No. 362 of 2015, for the offences punishable under sections 294(b), 323, 324, 506(ii) IPC. That apart, there is a suit pending in OS No.249 of 2011, for partition, on the file of Assistant Sessions Court, Madurai.

4.The learned Additional Public Prosecutor would submit that



the investigation is almost 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 allegations as against the petitioners, which have 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 Pokarnekar 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

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 first respondent is directed to complete the investigation, after inspecting the subject property and verify the possession and file a final report, within eight weeks, from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (Records)

// True Copy //

/ /2022

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

PNM

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.

<https://hcservicescourts.gov.in/hcservices/>



To:

1. The Inspector of Police,
Subramaniapuram Police Station,
Madurai City.
2. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

Crl.O.P. (MD)No.8984 of 2020
&Crl.M.P. (MD) Nos.4227 of 2020
14.03.2022

_RD(31.03.2022) 4P 3C