



CRL.O.P (MD) No.15472 of 2022

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 29.08.2022

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.SIVAGNANAM

CRL.O.P (MD) No.15472 of 2022

and

CrI.M.P(MD)No.10139 of 2022

S.Ravindran

...Petitioner/Respondent

Vs.

1.The Second Class Executive Magistrate/

The Tahsildar,
Office of the Tahsildar,
Keelakarai Taluk,
Ramanathapuram District.

2.The Inspector of Police,
Earvadi Dharga Police Station,
Ramanathapuram District.

3.The Sub Inspector of Police,
Earvadi Dharga Police Station,
Ramanathapuram District.

...Respondents/Complainants

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C., praying to call for the entire records connected to the summons/proceedings in M.C.No.94/41/2022, dated 04.08.2022 pending on the file of the first respondent and quash the same as illegal.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Malaikani
For Respondents : Mr.E.Antony Sahaya Prabhakar
Additional Public Prosecutor



CRL.O.P (MD) No.15472 of 2022

WEB COPY

ORDER

This petition is filed to quash the proceedings initiated by the first respondent in M.C.No.௮4/41/2022, dated 04.08.2022 as against the petitioner under Section 110(e) and 111 of Cr.P.C.

2.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that the impugned notice dated 04.08.2022 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 respondents 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.



CRL.O.P (MD) No.15472 of 2022

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 II Class Executive Magistrate-cum-Tashildar on 04.08.2022 under Section 111 Cr.P.C. On perusal of the impugned notice issued under Section 110 (e) and 111 Cr.P.C, it is seen that the proceedings under Section 110(e) Cr.P.C., 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 II Class Executive Magistrate-cum-Tashildar then pass final order. Unless the II Class Executive Magistrate-cum-Tashildar 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.



CRL.O.P (MD) No.15472 of 2022

7.In the instant case, the impugned summon, dated 04.08.2022 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 II Class Executive Magistrate-cum-Tashildar called the petitioner to appear certain enquiry on 08.08.2022. 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 in M.C.No.24/41/2022, dated 04.08.2022 on the file of the first respondent is hereby quashed. Consequently connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

29.08.2022

Internet: Yes/No
Index: Yes/No
vsd



WEB COPY



CRL.O.P (MD) No.15472 of 2022

To

- 1.The Second Class Executive Magistrate/
The Tahsildar,
Office of the Tahsildar,
Keelakarai Taluk,
Ramanathapuram District.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
Earvadi Dharga Police Station,
Ramanathapuram District.
- 3.The Sub Inspector of Police,
Earvadi Dharga Police Station,
Ramanathapuram District.
- 4.Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



CRL.O.P (MD) No.15472 of 2022

V.SIVAGNANAM, J.

vsd

CRL.O.P (MD) No.15472 of 2022
and
Crl.M.P(MD)No.10139 of 2022

29.08.2022