



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

Dated: 25.08.2022

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE V.SIVAGNANAM

Crl.O.P.(MD) No.15247 of 2022

and

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.10006 of 2022

T.Suresh Kumar

...Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Executive Magistrate cum Tahsildar,
Kalkulam Taluk,
Kanyakumari District.

2.The Inspector of Police,
Kotticode Police Station,
Kanniyakumari District.

3. The Sub-Inspector of Police,
Kotticode Police Station,
Kanniyakumari District.

...Respondents

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C.
praying to call for the records pertaining to the impugned proceedings
case No.A2/MC.164/2022 dated 27.07.2022 on the file of the 1st
respondent and quash the same.

For Petitioner : Mr.F.Deepak

For Respondents : Mr.E.Antony Sahaya Prabahar
Additional Public Prosecutor



ORDER

WEB COPY

This petition is filed to quash the impugned proceedings in case No.A2/MC.164/2022 dated 27.07.2022 on the file of the 1st respondent police.

2.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the impugned notice dated 27.07.2022 under Section 111 Cr.P.C under challenge is void, and the proceedings against the petitioner is nullity and without any jurisdiction as substance of information received as required is incomplete and ambiguous. Notice without substance of information vitiate the proceedings. Failure to comply with the mandatory requirements of Section 111 Cr.P.C vitiates the preliminary order consequently, the proceeding. Hence, the learned counsel pleaded to quash the impugned summons.

3.The learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent contended that in the impugned notice, adequate information is given to the petitioner, it is enough to the person notified to defend himself against the allegations. When they had clear notice of the case



against them, there may not be any prejudice. Hence, he pleaded to dismiss the original petition.

4.I have considered the matter in the light of the submissions made by the learned counsel for the parties.

5.The impugned notice is ordered by the Executive Magistrate-cum-Tahsildar on 27.07.2022 under Section 111 Cr.P.C. On perusal of the impugned notice issued under Section 110 and 111 Cr.P.C, it is seen that the proceedings under Section 110 is instituted by a preliminary order under Section 111 Cr.P.C, which shall comply the following conditions:-

- (i) the order must be written
- (ii) substance of information against the person must be disclosed
- (iii) the amount of bond, period for the bond, number, character and class of sureties must be disclosed in the preliminary order under Section 111 Cr.P.C

6.The issue of notice under Section 111 Cr.P.C is judicial act, the object behind this notice is being to enable the person to prepare for the



defence. After the order is served, an enquiry is to be held under Section 116 Cr.P.C. After concluding enquiry, the Executive Magistrate-cum-Tashildar then pass final order. Unless the Executive Magistrate-cum-Tahsildar place with the mandatory requirements of the provisions of law under Section 111 Cr.P.C, they will have no jurisdiction to direct the person to proceed against to appear before him or to secure their persons for the purpose of enquiry.

7.In the instant case, the impugned summon dated 27.07.2022 mentioning only vague information about the complaint/information given by the Inspector of Police, substance of information received as required is incomplete. Thus, the notice without substance of information nullify the proceeding. The failure to comply with the mandatory requirements of setting forth, the substance of information under Section 111 Cr.P.C vitiate the notice/order and consequently, the proceeding would be quashed.

8.Further, a perusal of the impugned notice, it is seen that the Executive Magistrate-cum-Tashildar called the petitioner to appear



certain enquiry on 27.07.2022. Now, the said date is over. Hence, the impugned proceedings is liable to be quashed.

9. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is allowed. The impugned order dated 27.07.2022 on the file of the first respondent. is hereby quashed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

25.08.2022

Internet: Yes
Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non speaking order
ksa

To

1. The Executive Magistrate cum Tahsildar,
Kalkulam Taluk,
Kanyakumari District.
2. The Inspector of Police,
Kotticode Police Station,
Kanniyakumari District.
3. The Sub-Inspector of Police,
Kotticode Police Station,
Kanniyakumari District.
4. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



V.SIVAGNANAM, J.

ksa

CrI.O.P.(MD) No.15247 of 2022

25.08.2022