



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 07.02.2022

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN

Crl.O.P. (MD)No.18490 of 2021

and

Crl.M.P(MD)Nos.10195 & 10197 of 2021

WEB COPY

Jeyaraman

... Petitioner/Accused No.2

Vs.

1.The State represented by,
The Inspector of Police,
DCB Police Station,
Madurai District.

... 1st Respondent/Complainant

2.Rajarajan

... 2nd Respondent/
Defacto Complainant

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C., to call for the records relating to the charge sheet in C.C.No.8 of 2021 on the file of the Special Judicial Magistrate (Special Court for Exclusive Trial of Land Grabbing Cases), Madurai, insofar as the petitioner is concerned and quash the same.

For Petitioner	: Mr.T.Palanisamy
For R - 1	: Mr.B.Thanga Aravind Government Advocate
For R - 2	: Mr.K.Mahendran

ORDER

This petition has been filed to quash the proceedings in C.C.No.8 of 2021 on the file of the Special Judicial Magistrate (Special Court for Exclusive Trial of Land Grabbing Cases), Madurai, as against the petitioner.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner had purchased a land in Survey No.184/2B measuring an extent of 0.23 hectare from one Mohammed Abbas/the first accused and 6 others by a registered document in Document No.1521 of 2016, dated 07.09.2016. While so, the second respondent had made a complaint before the first respondent as if the petitioner and the first accused had cheated the mother of the defacto complainant by creating and forging the documents resulting in filing of the F.I.R in Crime No.33 of 2018 on the file of the first respondent for the offences punishable under Sections 420, 465, 468 and 120(B) I.P.C. The first respondent filed the impugned charge sheet in C.C.No.8 of 2021 against the petitioner on the file of the Special Judicial Magistrate (Special Court for Exclusive Trial of Land Grabbing



Cases), Madurai. Challenged the impugned charge sheet, the present petition is filed.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is the bonafide purchaser and he has absolutely no knowledge about the oral agreement between the first accused and the defacto complainant. Hence, he prayed to quash the charge-sheet.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor would submit that the trial has been commenced and some of the witnesses have been examined in this case.

5. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, the learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the first respondent and the learned counsel appearing for the second respondent.

6. It is relevant to rely upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India passed in **Crl.A.No.579 of 2019** dated **02.04.2019** in the case of **Devendra Prasad Singh Vs. State of Bihar & Anr.**, as follows:-

" 12. So far as the second ground is concerned, we are of the view that the High Court while hearing the application under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. had no jurisdiction to appreciate the statement of the witnesses and record a finding that there were inconsistencies in their statements and, therefore, there was no prima facie case made out against respondent No.2. In our view, this could be done only in the trial while deciding the issues on the merits or/and by the Appellate Court while deciding the appeal arising out of the final order passed by the Trial Court but not in Section 482 Cr.P.C. proceedings.

13. In view of the foregoing discussion, we allow the appeal, set aside the impugned order and restore the aforementioned complaint case to its original file for being proceeded with on merits in accordance with law.

7. Recently, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India dealing in respect of the very same issue in **Crl.A.No.1572 of 2019** dated 17.10.2019 in the case of **Central Bureau of Investigation Vs. Arvind Khanna**, wherein, it has been held as follows:

"19. After perusing the impugned order and on hearing the submissions made by the learned senior counsels on both sides, we are of the view



that the impugned order passed by the High Court is not sustainable. In a petition filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C., the High Court has recorded findings on several disputed facts and allowed the petition. Defence of the accused is to be tested after appreciating the evidence during trial. The very fact that the High Court, in this case, went into the most minute details, on the allegations made by the appellant-C.B.I., and the defence put-forth by the respondent, led us to a conclusion that the High Court has exceeded its power, while exercising its inherent jurisdiction under Section 482 Cr.P.C.

20. In our view, the assessment made by the High Court at this stage, when the matter has been taken cognizance by the Competent Court, is completely incorrect and uncalled for."

8. Further the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India also held in the order dated **02.12.2019** in **Crl.A.No.1817 of 2019** in the case of **M.Jayanthi Vs. K.R.Meenakshi & anr**, as follows:

"9. It is too late in the day to seek reference to any authority for the proposition that while invoking the power under Section 482 Cr.P.C for quashing a complaint or a charge, the Court should not embark upon an enquiry into the validity of the evidence available. All that the Court should see is as to whether there are allegations in the complaint which form the basis for the ingredients that constitute certain offences complained of. The Court may also be entitled to see (i) whether the preconditions requisite for taking cognizance have been complied with or not; and (ii) whether the allegations contained in the complaint, even if accepted in entirety, would not constitute the offence alleged.

.....

13. A look at the complaint filed by the appellant would show that the appellant had incorporated the ingredients necessary for prosecuting the respondents for the offences alleged. The question whether the appellant will be able to prove the allegations in a manner known to law would arise only at a later stage....."



The above judgments are squarely applicable to this case and as such, the points raised by the petitioner cannot be considered by this Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C.

9. In fact, after purchasing the subject property belonged to the defacto complainant from the first accused, when the second accused about to take possession, there was objection by the second respondent and as such, the petitioner also lodged a complaint before the Inspector of Police, Othakadai Police Station. It shows that the petitioner without even verifying the property with regard to who is in possession and enjoyment of the said property and after verifying all the documents, he had purchased the property from the first accused. That apart, the second respondent made specific allegation that the petitioner colluded with the first accused and conspired to purchase the subject property only to cheat the second respondent. Therefore, *prima facie*, there are materials available to attract the offence as alleged by the first respondent.

10. In view of the above discussion, this Court is not inclined to quash the proceedings in C.C.No.8 of 2021 on the file of the Special Judicial Magistrate (Special Court for Exclusive Trial of Land Grabbing Cases), Madurai. The petitioner is at liberty to raise all the grounds before the trial Court. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, the personal appearance of the petitioner is dispensed with and he shall be represented by a counsel after filing appropriate application. However, the petitioner shall be present before the Court at the time of furnishing of copies, framing charges, questioning under Section 313 Cr.P.C. and at the time of passing judgment. The trial Court is directed to complete the trial within a period of twelve months from the date of receipt of copy of this Order.

11. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petitions are closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (AD-I)

// True Copy //

/ /2022

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

ps

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.

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



To

1.The Special Judicial Magistrate
(Special Court for Exclusive Trial of Land Grabbing Cases),
Madurai

2.The Inspector of Police,
DCB Police Station,
Madurai District.

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

+1 CC to M/s.K.MAHENDRAN, Advocate (SR-4628[F] dated 07/02/2022)

Order made in

Crl.O.P(MD)No.18490 of 2021

07.02.2022

SB (CO)

GC(18.02.2022) 5P 5C