



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 22.03.2022

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.20843 of 2021

and

Crl.M.P(MD)No.11949 of 2021

1.Sivasamy

2.Jesuraj

... Petitioners/Accused Nos.1 & 2

Vs.

1.The State represented by,
The Inspector of Police,
Vaiyampatti Police Station,
Vaiyampatti,
Trichy District.

(Crime No.471 of 2021). ... 1st Respondent/Complainant

2.Maharani

... 2nd Respondent/Defacto Complainant

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C.,
to call for the records relating to the FIR in Crime No.471 of 2021
on the file of the first respondent and quash the same.

For Petitioners	: Mr.B.Prahalad Ravi
For R - 1	: Mr.B.Thanga Aravindh Government Advocate (Crl. Side)
For R - 2	: Mr.T.M.Madasamy

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed to quash the
F.I.R in Crime No.471 of 2021 on the file of the first respondent.

2. The second respondent lodged a complaint alleging that the
petitioners said to have harassed the defacto complainant's husband
Ilayaraja in connected with the debt borrowed by him on 08.11.2021
and thus, he has suffered a lot and committed suicide on the same
day owing to the said harassment. On the basis of the said
complaint, the first respondent registered F.I.R in Crime No.471 of
2021 for the offence under Section 306 of I.P.C as against the
petitioners.

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

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



4. On a perusal of the materials available on record, it is seen that the defacto complainant's husband spent money for the marriage of the first petitioner. The first petitioner repaid the amount leaving Rs.15,000/- to her husband. Hence, he insisted the first petitioner for the repayment of money. Instead of paying Rs.15,000/-, the first petitioner gave a gold chain weighing 8 grams to her husband before three years. In the year 2020, the first petitioner without repaying Rs.15,000/- insisted her husband the return of his chain. The first petitioner also gave a complaint against her husband before the first respondent. The first respondent directed the first petitioner to repay Rs.15,000/- and get the chain from her husband. On 08.11.2021, the petitioners came to her residence and scolded her husband with un-parliamentary words. On the same day, the defacto complainant's husband consumed poison and on 09.11.2021, he died.

5. It is seen from the First Information Report that there are specific allegations as against the petitioners, which have 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 Pokarnekar 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.....

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. However, the first respondent is directed to complete the investigation and file a final report before the concerned Magistrate, within a period of twelve weeks from the date



of receipt of a copy of this order. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

WEB COPY

// True Copy //

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (Records)

/ /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.

To

- 1.The Inspector of Police,
Vaiyampatti Police Station,
Vaiyampatti,
Trichy District.
- 2.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

+1 CC to M/s.B.PRAHALAD RAVI, Advocate (SR-13832[F]
dated 23/03/2022)

Order made in
Crl.O.P (MD) No.20843 of 2021
22.03.2022

SP(CO)
GC(04.04.2022) 4P 4C