



WEB COPY



Crl.R.C.(MD).No.738 of 2022

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 18.10.2022

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE G.ILANGO VAN

Crl.R.C.(MD).No.738 of 2022

Parthipan

.. Petitioner/ Detenu

Vs.

1.The Sub-Divisional Executive Magistrate/
The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Tenkasi,
Tenkasi District.

2.The Second Class Executive Magistrate/The Tahsildar,
Alangulam,
Tenkasi District.

3.The Sub-Inspector of Police,
Pavoorchathiram Police Station,
Pavoorchathiram,
Tenkasi District.

4.The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Palayamkottai,
Tirunelveli District.

... Respondents/Complainant

PRAYER: This Civil Revision Case is filed under Sections 397 r/w 401 of the Criminal Procedure Code, to call for the records pertaining to the order, dated 10.06.2022 passed by the 1st respondent/the Sub-Divisional Executive Magistrate/ The Revenue Divisional Officer, Tenkasi, in M.C.No.110 of 2020 and set aside the same as illegal.



Crl.R.C.(MD).No.738 of 2022

For Petitioner : Mr.G.Pragalathan

For Respondents : Mr.S.Manikandan
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

ORDER

This Criminal Revision Case has been filed to set aside the order, dated 10.06.2022, passed by the 1st respondent/the Sub-Divisional Executive Magistrate/ The Revenue Divisional Officer, Tenkasi, in M.C.No. 110 of 2020.

2.The proceedings under Section 122(1)(b) has been initiated against the petitioner, for violation of bond executed under Section 110(e) Cr.P.C. Reading of the order shows that there is complete non-application of mind. It has been stated that on 17.05.2022, summon was issued to the petitioner and on 10.06.2022 this order has been passed by the first respondent, which is not reasonable and proper. According to the learned counsel for the petitioner, before passing the above said order, no enquiry was undertaken as contemplated under Section 122(1)(b) of Cr.P.C.

3.The learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent submitted that the procedure has been followed properly.



Crl.R.C.(MD).No.738 of 2022

According to the learned Additional Public Prosecutor, statement of witnesses has been recorded on 31.05.2022 and sufficient opportunities were given to him. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor circulated a copy of the statement recorded from the petitioner. Though the petitioner has executed sureties before the first respondent, in violation of his own bond, he has involved in the offences in Crime No.139/2022 before the third respondent police. Therefore, the impugned order has been passed by the first respondent.

4.The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that even though subsequent happenings are there, the procedure has not been properly followed. For that purpose, the learned counsel for the petitioner relied upon a decision of this Court in **P.Sathish @ Sathish Kumar Vs. State represented by the Inspector of Police**, reported in **2019 (2) MWN (Cr.) 136** and the relevant passages are extracted herein.

“1.Notice to be sent to the person by the Executive Magistrate to show cause as to why action under Section 122(1)(b) of Cr.P.C should not be taken for breach of the bond executed under Section 117 Cr.P.C on a date fixed.

2.At the enquiry, the Executive Magistrate should furnish the person the materials sought to be relied upon, including



statements of witnesses, if any, in the vernacular (if the person is not knowing the language other than his mother tongue).

3.If the person wishes to engage an Advocate to represent him at the enquiry, an opportunity to have a counsel of his choice should be provided to him.

4.The Executive Magistrate shall inform the person about his right to have the assistance of a lawyer for defending him in the enquiry.

5.The enquiry shall be conducted by the Executive Magistrate on the notified date or such other date as may be fixed and the person should be allowed to participate in the same.

6.At the enquiry, an opportunity should be given to the person to :(i) Cross-examine the official witnesses, if any and (ii) produce documents and witnesses, if any, in support of his case.

7.Such Executive Magistrate or his successor in office, should then, apply his mind on the materials available on record, in the enquiry, and pass speaking order.

8.An order under Section 122(1)(b) of Cr.P.C should contain the grounds upon which the Executive Magistrate is satisfied that the person has breached the bond.

9.A copy of the order should be furnished to the person along with the materials produced at the enquiry.

10.The enquiry, as far as possible shall be completed



WEB COPY



Crl.R.C.(MD).No.738 of 2022

within 30 days and at no circumstances, the enquiry shall be adjourned unnecessarily. The advocates, who appear on behalf of the persons concerned, are expected to co-operate with the enquiry process for its expeditious completion.”

5.In view of the above, this petition is liable to be allowed and accordingly, allowed and the order passed by the 1st respondent/the Sub-Divisional Executive Magistrate/ The Revenue Divisional Officer, Tenkasi, under Section 122(1)(b) Cr.P.C. in M.C.No.110 of 2020, dated 10.06.2022, is hereby quashed. However, liberty is granted to the respondent herein to initiate fresh action, if so required, by following the procedure that has been set out in the above said Judgment.

18.10.2022

Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No
TM

To

- 1.The Sub-Divisional Executive Magistrate/
The Revenue Divisional Officer, Tenkasi, Tenkasi District.
- 2.The Second Class Executive Magistrate/The Tahsildar,
Alangulam, Tenkasi District.
- 3.The Sub-Inspector of Police, Pavoorchathiram Police Station,
Pavoorchathiram, Tenkasi District.



Crl.R.C.(MD).No.738 of 2022

4.The Superintendent of Prison, Central Prison, Palayamkottai,
Tirunelveli District.

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



WEB COPY



Crl.R.C.(MD).No.738 of 2022

G.ILANGO VAN,J.

TM

Crl.R.C.(MD).No.738 of 2022

18.10.2022