



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 14.03.2022

CORAM:

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

CrI.O.P. (MD)No.10956 of 2020

&

CrI.M.P. (MD)Nos.4999 of 2020 & 950 of 2021

WEB COPY

Pirai Sokkar Balaji ...Petitioner/Sole Accused
Vs.

1. The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Kodaikanal Sub-Division,
Kodaikanal, Dindigul District.

2.The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Kodaikanal, Dindigul District.
(Crime No. 02 of 2020)

... Respondents/Complainants

3. Chandhira ...Respondent/Defacto Complainant

Prayer: This Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C.to call for the records on the file of the 2nd respondent, All Women Police Station, Kodaikanal, Dindigul District in Crime No.02 of 2020 and to quash the same


For Petitioner	: Mr.S.C.Herold Singh
For R1 & R2	: Mr.B.Thanga Aravindh
	Government Advocate (Criminal Side)
For R3	: Mr.M.Mohan Gandhi

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed to quash the proceedings in Crime No. 02 of 2020 on the file of the second respondent police.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant's minor daughter, who was born on 23.04.2008 and after completing her fifth standard, was at home. On 23.04.2008 at 11.00AM, the accused molested the minor daughter of the defacto complainant. The accused ran away from the spot, while the defacto complainant's daughter raised alarm. Hence, the defacto complainant lodged complaint against the accused person. 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. Without any base, the second respondent police registered a case in Crime No. 02 of 2020 for the offences under Sections 7 and 8 of Protection of Child from



Sexual Offences Act, 2012 and Sections 3(1)(w)(i) and 3(2)(Va) of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 as against the petitioner.

4.The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) 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 second 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.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 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 second Information Report. Hence this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed. However, the second respondent police is directed to 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 petitions are closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CS-III)


// True Copy //

/ /2022

Sub Assistant Registrar (CS)

PNM

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



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.

WEB COPY

To:

1. The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Kodaikanal Sub-Division,
Kodaikanal,
Dindigul District.

2. The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Kodaikanal,
Dindigul District.

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

+1 CC to M/s.S.C.HEROLD SINGH, Advocate (SR-12359[F] dated
16/03/2022)

ORDER IN

Crl.O.P. (MD)No.10956 of 2020

&

Crl.M.P. (MD)Nos.4999 of 2020 & 950 of 2021

14.03.2022

KG (CO)

GC (24.03.2022) 4P 5C