



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT
DATED : 25.04.2022
CORAM

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

WEB COPY

CrI.O.P(MD)No.15985 of 2020

Mareeswarann ... Petitioner/Sole Accused
Vs.

1. State represented by
The Inspector of Police,
Vallioor Police Station,
Tirunelveli District.
Crime No.47 of 2020 ... 1st Respondent/Complainant

2.Subramanian ...2nd Respondent/De-facto Complainant

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C., praying to call for the records pertaining to the FIR in Crime No.47 of 2020 for the offences under Sections 294(b), 352 and 506(2) IPC on the file of the first respondent police and quash the same as illegal.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.R.Anbarasu
For R1 : Mr.R.M.Anbunithi
Additional Public Prosecutor
For R2 : Mr.R.Kannan

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed to quash the proceedings in Crime No.47 of 2020, on the file of the first respondent police.

2.The case of the prosecution is that on 26.02.2020 at about 01.30 p.m, the petitioner came to the de-facto complainant's tea shop and eating tea and vada and thereafter, went away from that place without making any payment. When the de-facto complainant asked him to pay the amount, the petitioner abused the de-facto complainant in filthy language and attacked him. Therefore, the present case came to be registered against the petitioners.

3.The learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. Without any base, the first respondent police registered a case in Crime No.47 of 2020 for the offences under Sections 294(b), 352 and 506(ii) of IPC as against the petitioner.



4. Heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.

5. It is seen from the First Information Report that there are specific allegation as against the petitioner, 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.

6. 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 Pokarnekhar vs. the State of Maharashtra & ors.**, as 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.....

WEB COPY

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."

7. In view of the above discussion, this Court is not inclined to quash the First Information Report. Hence, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar ()

// True Copy //

/ /2022

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

vsd

Note: In view of the present lock down owing to COVID-19 pandemic, a web copy of the order may be utilized for official purposes, but, ensuring that the copy of the order that is presented is the correct copy, shall be the responsibility of the advocate/litigant concerned.

To

1. The Inspector of Police,
Vallioor Police Station,
Tirupulveli District.

<https://hcservices.courts.gov.in/Hcservices>



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

WEB COPY

Crl.O.P (MD) No.15985 of 2020
25.04.2022

SS/30.05.2022 : 4P/3C