



CRL.O.P(MD)No.12377 of 2022

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 11.07.2022

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.SIVAGNANAM

CRL.O.P(MD)No.12377 of 2022

and

CrI.M.P(MD) No.7828 of 2022

J.Ruban @ Ruban Kumar

... Petitioners

.VS

1. The Inspector of Police
North Police Station
Tuticorin, Tuticorin District

2.S.Rajakumar

...Respondents.

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C, praying to call for the records in Crime No.231 of 2017 on the file of the first respondent police and to quash the same against the the petitioner/accused No.2

For Petitioner : Mr.Ka.Raamakrishnan

For Respondent : Mr.M.Sakthikumar
No.1 Government Advocate(CrI.Side)



CRL.O.P(MD)No.12377 of 2022

ORDER

WEB COPY

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed to quash the First Information Report in Crime No.231 of 2017 on the file of the first respondent police.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner along with other accused due to previous enmity on 10.04.2017 trespassed in the house of the defacto complainant, scolded in filthy language, assaulted the defacto complainant and her son and also threatened them with dire consequences. Hence the case came to be registered.

3.The learned counsel for the petitioner submit that the First Information Report has been registered against the petitioner and others in Crime No. 231 of 2017 for the offences under Sections 448,294(b), 323,427,506(2) of IPC and Section 4 of TNPHW Act. He further submitted that Section 294(b) of IPC will not attract since the alleged occurrence took place inside the house of the defacto complainant and Section 448 of IPC will not attract because the petitioner only entered into the house of the defacto complainant only for the purpose of demanding cell phone. With



CRL.O.P(MD)No.12377 of 2022

regard to the alleged injuries, the defacto complainant had not went to the hospital for taking treatment and further the complaint was filed with the delay of 15 days and the said complaint was only sent through post. Hence he seeks to quash the entire proceedings.

4.The learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) appearing for the respondent police that the investigation is under progress and now the offence has been altered to Sections 448,294(b),352,506(ii) of IPC and Section 4 of TNPHW Act.

5. I have considered the submission of the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned Government Advocate (criminal side) appearing for the respondent police.

6. 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



CRL.O.P(MD)No.12377 of 2022

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.

7.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



CRL.O.P(MD)No.12377 of 2022

their entirety, do no 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 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.

8.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.



CRL.O.P(MD)No.12377 of 2022

9.If the allegations made in the First Information Report *prima facie* discloses a cognizable offences, interference with the investigation is not proper, because that amounts to interfere with the statutory power of the police to investigate a cognizable offences in accordance with the provisions of Cr.P.C. Without thorough investigation, it is not possible or proper to hold whether the allegations made by the complainant are true or not. Hence, the investigation should have been allowed to continue, so that on filing of the final report under Section 173 Cr.P.C, the affected party could pursue its remedy against the final report in accordance with law.

10.Therefore, the police will proceed to complete the investigation fairly on the same expeditious and submit the required final report to the learned Jurisdictional Judicial Magistrate who shall act in accordance with law.

11 .In the case on hand, a perusal of records, discloses the fact that the case in Crime No.231 of 2017 has been registered for the offences under Sections 448, 294(b),323,427,506(2) of IPC and Section 4 of TNPHW Act on the complaint given by one Rajakumari W/o.Sundar. According to the



CRL.O.P(MD)No.12377 of 2022

complainant, the occurrence took place on 10.04.2017 at about 8.00 pm., while the complainant husband was out of house. The accused along with others entered into house demanding cell phone given to her son by abusing her in abusive language, assaulted her and also snatched the gold bracelet worn by her son , thereafter she gave complaint on the next day. After 6 days on 16.04.2017 she saw the alleged chain in the cow dung in front of her house, thereafter she went to the police station informed the fact also requested them to take action against the accused persons. With regard to the alleged assault by the accused, the complainant was not sent for any medical treatment. Whether the defacto complainant was assaulted by the accused persons or not, whether the accused persons entered into the house of the defacto complainant and committed criminal trespass or not to be investigation and for what purpose the accused persons entered into the house of the defacto complainant needs to be investigated.



CRL.O.P(MD)No.12377 of 2022

WEB COPY

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

11.07.2022

Internet:Yes./No

Index:Yes/no

aav

To

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



WEB COPY



CRL.O.P(MD)No.12377 of 2022

V.SIVAGNANAM, J.

aav

CRL.O.P(MD)No.12377 of 2022
and
Crl.M.P(MD) No.7828 of 2022

11.07.2022