



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 22.03.2022

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE **G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN**

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.14429 of 2020

and

Crl.M.P(MD) No.6760 of 2020

WEB COPY

- 1.Natarajan
- 2.T.Ponnuchamy
- 3.Prema
- 4.Prithvi

... Petitioners/Accused 1 to 4
Vs

- 1.The State Rep by
The Inspector of Police,
Udayalipatti Police Station,
Pudukkottai District. ... 1st Respondent/Complainant
(Crime No.172 of 2020)

- 2.Manjula ... 2nd Respondent/
Defacto Complainant


Prayer: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. to Call for the records pertaining to the Crime No.172 of 2020 on the file of the Inspector of Police, Udayalipatti Police Station, Pudukkottai District and quash the same.

For Petitioner	:	Mr.B.Jameel Arasu
For Respondents No.1	:	Mr.B.Thanga Aravindh Government Advocate(Crl.Side)
For R2	:	Mr.S.Ramsundar Vijayraj

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed to Call for the records pertaining to the Crime No.172 of 2020 on the file of the Inspector of Police, Udayalipatti Police Station, Pudukkottai District and quash the same.

2. The prosecution case is that the petitioners' changed the ownership of the car by forging the defacto complainant's husband signature, when the same was questioned by the defacto complainant, the petitioners evaded to give any reply and also abused her in filthy language and also threatened her with dire consequences. In that regard a case in Crime No.172 of 2020 was registered against the petitioners under Sections 420, 294(b), 447, 506(i), 379 (NP), 406 and 420 of IPC.



3. The learned Counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners are innocent and they have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. Without any base, the first respondent police registered a case in Crime No.172 of 2020 for the offences under Sections 420, 294(b), 447, 506(i), 379 (NP), 406 and 420 of IPC as against the petitioners.

4. The learned Government Advocate(Crl.Side) 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.

6. It is seen from the First Information Report that there are specific allegation as against the petitioners, 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.**, where in it is held 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 First Information Report. Hence this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed. However, the 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 petition is closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CS I)

// True Copy //

/ /2022

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

tta

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



To

1.The Chief Judicial Magistrate,
Pudukkottai.

2.The Inspector of Police,
Udayalipatti Police Station,
Pudukkottai District.

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

Crl.O.P. (MD) No.14429 of 2020
22.03.2022

MGJ(30.03.2022) 4P 4C