



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.7651 of 2019

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 07.11.2023

CORAM:

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

Crl.O.P.No.7651 of 2019 and
Crl.M.P.Nos.4185 & 4186 of 2019

- 1) V.P.S.Santhakumar
- 2) Jothi
- 3) Vijayaraj

... Petitioners

-Vs-

The State Rep. by
Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch,
Egmore,
Chennai.

... Respondent

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition has been filed under Section 482 of Criminal Procedure Code, praying to set aside the order of recorded endorsement dated 23.01.2019 prior to examination of P.W.32 on 23.01.2019 in the deposition of P.W.32 itself and to direct the mandatory requirement under Section 207 of Criminal Procedure Code.

For Petitioners : Mr.R.Loganathan

For Respondent : Mr.L.Baskaran,
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)



CrI.O.P.No.7651 of 2019

WEB COPY

ORDER

The Criminal Original Petition has been filed to set aside the recorded endorsement dated 23.01.2019 prior to examination of P.W.32 on 23.01.2019 in C.C.No.9699 of 2002 on the file of the Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore at Allikulam, Chennai.

2. The petitioners are accused in C.C.No.9699 of 2002 on the file of the learned Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Allikulam, Chennai. On the complaint lodged by the defacto complainant, FIR has been registered in Crime No.553 of 1997 on the file of the respondent police under Sections 409, r/w.120B of IPC as against the petitioners. The allegations are that the accused persons had collected more than Rs.3,50,00,000/- from 1492 victims by way of deposit and thereafter they failed to return the same.

3. After completion of investigation, the respondent police filed final report and the same has been taken cognizance by the trial Court in C.C.No.9699 of 2002. While pending trial, the petitioners are seeking order to set aside the recorded endorsement dated 23.01.2019 prior to the examination



Crl.O.P.No.7651 of 2019

of P.W.32 on 23.01.2019 in C.C.9699 of 2002.

WEB COPY

4. Heard, the learned counsel appearing on either side and perused the materials placed before this Court.

5. On perusal of records revealed that during trial, the prosecution had examined 30 witnesses. However, the petitioners did not cross-examine them for the reasons best known to them, though they were given enough opportunity to cross examine the witnesses. Thereafter, the petitioners filed petitions under Section 311 of Cr.P.C., to recall the prosecution witnesses to cross examine them, that too after a period of 15 years. It is nothing but to stall the proceedings and as such the trial Court rightly dismissed the petitions.

6. In fact, already this Court as well as the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India directed the trial Courts to complete the trial in the cases which were pending more than five years without any further delay. The present case is of the year 2002 and it is pending for the past 21 years. Therefore, this Court finds no infirmity or illegality in the order passed by the trial Court in Crl.M.P.Nos.2226 of 2018 & 7494 of 2016.



Cr.O.P.No.7651 of 2019

WEB COPY

7. The other petitions are filed challenging the adjudication while examining the prosecution witnesses. While examining the prosecution witness, the prosecution marked the deposit receipts. However, it was objected by the petitioners. The trial Court accepted the reasons given by the prosecution and marked the same thereby rejected the objections raised by the petitioners. Further the petitioners objected to mark the fixed deposit receipts, since they were all received at the time of furnishing copy as contemplated under Section 207 of Cr.P.C.

8. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that the accused persons must be served with copies of documents which are relied upon by the prosecution. He also relied upon the judgment reported in **2021 (10) SCC 598** in the case of ***In Re:Criminal Trials Guidelines Regarding Inadequacies and Deficiencies v. State of Andhra Pradesh & Others*** in which, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India framed guidelines and also gave procedures to be followed by the trial Courts. Accordingly, free copies to be furnished under Section 207 of Cr.P.C.

9. On perusal of records revealed that all the documents were



CrI.O.P.No.7651 of 2019

already furnished to the petitioners under Section 207 of Cr.P.C. In order to stall the proceedings, the petitioners now challenged the adjudication order before this Court. Therefore, the judgement cited by the learned counsel appearing for the petitioners is not applicable to the case on hand. This Court finds no infirmity or illegality in the adjudication order passed by the trial Court and the present petition is liable to be dismissed. However, the trial Court is directed to proceed with the case in accordance with law.

10. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

07.11.2023

Index :Yes/No

Internet : Yes/No

Speaking order/non-speaking order
gvn

To

1) The Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch,
Egmore,
Chennai.

2. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.7651 of 2019

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN, J.

gvn

Crl.O.P.No.7651 of 2019 and
Crl.M.P.Nos.4185 & 4186 of 2019

07.11.2023