



CRL.O.P(MD)No.13752 of 2022

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 01.08.2022

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.SIVAGNANAM

CRL.O.P(MD)No.13752 of 2022

and

CrI.M.P(MD)No.8783 of 2022

1. Nagarajan,

2. Ajith,

3. Ajay,

: Petitioners

Vs

1.State represented by
The Inspector of Police,
Samayanallur Police Station,
Madurai District
(Crime No. 100 of 2022).

2. Sivakumar,

: Respondents

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C, praying to call for the records pertaining to the case in Crime No. 100 of 2022 dated 20.05.2022, on the file of the first respondent ie. the Inspector of Police, Samyanallur Police Station, Madurai District and quash the same



CRL.O.P(MD)No.13752 of 2022

and all further proceedings.

WEB COPY

For Petitioner : M/s. Asaithambi.S,

For R1 : Mr.M.Sakthi Kumar,
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

O R D E R

This criminal original petition has been filed seeking to quash the FIR in Crime No. 100 of 2022 dated 20.05.2022, on the file of the first respondent.

2.The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the third petitioner was assaulted by the second respondent and when he got treatment at Government Rajaji Hospital, the respondent police received the complaint and registered an FIR in Crime No.99 of 2022, for the offences under Sections 294(b), 324 and 506(2) IPC. The second respondent, to safeguard himself, also lodged a false complaint against the petitioners, for which, an FIR in Crime No.100 of 2022, for the offences under Sections 294(b), 323, 324 and 506(2), Since the case registered against the

2/9



CRL.O.P(MD)No.13752 of 2022

petitioners is a false one, it has to be quashed.

WEB COPY

3.The learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) appearing for the respondent police submitted that both the cases are under investigation.

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.

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.On a perusal of records, it is seen that the second respondent was assaulted by the accused persons, with an iron rod and he sustained injuries in his face, hand and shoulder. He got treatment in the Government Rajaji Hospital and later he was treated at a private hospital in Room No.313. Further, the third petitioner also lodged a complaint against the second respondent. Hence both the cases have to be investigated.



CRL.O.P(MD)No.13752 of 2022

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 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



CRL.O.P(MD)No.13752 of 2022

to spite him due to private and personal grudge.

WEB COPY

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.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.

11.Therefore, the police will proceed to complete the investigation fairly on the same expeditious and submit the required final report to the



CRL.O.P(MD)No.13752 of 2022

learned Jurisdictional Judicial Magistrate who shall act in accordance with law.

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.

01.08.2022

Internet:Yes./No
Index:Yes/no
lr

To
1.The Inspector of Police,
Samayanallur Police Station,
Madurai District

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



WEB COPY



CRL.O.P(MD)No.13752 of 2022

V.SIVAGNANAM, J.

lr

ORDER IN
CRL.O.P(MD)No.13752 of 2022

01.08.2022