



Crl.R.C.(MD).No.934 of 2022

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 27.10.2022

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE G.ILANGO VAN

Crl.R.C.(MD).No.934 of 2022

in

Cr.MP(MD)No.11537 of 2022

Selvam

.. Petitioner/Respondent

Vs.

1.The Second Class Administrative Magistrate and
Revenue Thasildar,
Uthamapalayam,
Theni District.

2.The State represented by
The Inspector of Police,
Gudalur South Police Station,
Theni District.
(LIR No.53 of 2022)

3.The Superintendent of Prison,
District Prison, Theni.

... 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 relating to the 1st respondent in proceeding in Na.Ka.No.6357/2022/A8, dated 07.07.2022, and set aside the same as illegal.

For Petitioner : Mr.D.Rameshkumar

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



Crl.R.C.(MD).No.934 of 2022

ORDER

WEB COPY

This Criminal Revision Case has been filed seeking quashment of the order passed by the Second Class Administrative Magistrate and Revenue Thasildar, Uthamapalayam, Theni District, in Na.Ka.No. 6357/2022/A8, dated 07.07.2022.

2.The proceedings under Section 122(1)(b) has been initiated against the petitioner, for violation of bond executed under Section 110 Cr.P.C. Reading of the order shows that there is complete non-application of mind. It has been stated that on 05.07.2022, summon was issued to the petitioner and on 07.07.2022, 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. According to the learned Additional Public Prosecutor, sufficient opportunities were given to him. Though the petitioner has executed sureties before the first respondent, in violation of his own bond, 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 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 Second Class Administrative Magistrate and Revenue Thasildar, Uthamapalayam, Theni District, in Na.Ka.No.6357/2022/A8, dated 07.07.2022, is hereby quashed. However, liberty is granted to the respondent herein to initiate



Crl.R.C.(MD).No.934 of 2022

fresh action, if so required, by following the procedure that has been set out in the above said Judgment. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

27.10.2022

Index : Yes / No

Internet : Yes / No

dss

To

- 1.The Second Class Administrative Magistrate and Revenue Thasildar,
Uthamapalayam, Theni District,
- 2.The Second Class Administrative Magistrate and
Revenue Thasildar,
Uthamapalayam,
Theni District.
- 3.The State represented by
The Inspector of Police,
Gudalur South Police Station,
Theni District.
(LIR No.53 of 2022)
- 4.The Superintendent of Prison,
District Prison,
Theni.
- 5.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.R.C.(MD).No.934 of 2022

G.ILANGO VAN,J.

dss

Crl.R.C.(MD).No.934 of 2022

27.10.2022