



CRL.O.P.No.9942 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 04.05.2023

CORAM:

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

CRL.O.P.No.9942 of 2023 &
CrI.M.P.No.6550 of 2023

Ruthirakumar

... Petitioner/Accused (A2)

Vs.

1.The Inspector of Police,
Chunambedu Police Station,
Chengalpet District.

... 1st Respondent / Complainant

2.Sarasu

... 2nd Respondent / Defacto Complainant

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. praying to call for the records relating to the proceedings in Crime No.08/2023 on the file of the first respondent and quash the same.

For Petitioner : Mr.V.Bhagiradhan

For Respondent 1 : Mr.N.S.Suganthan,
Government Advocate (CrI. Side)

ORDER

This petition has been filed to quash the F.I.R. in Crime No.08 of 2023 registered by the first respondent police for offences under Sections 120B,



CRL.O.P.No.9942 of 2023

294(b), 323, 324 & 506(1) of IPC r/w section 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act, 2002, as against the petitioner.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner and the defacto complainant are same villagers. On 12.01.2023 at about 08.45 a.m., the petitioner along with other accused wrongfully restraining the defacto complainant and scolded filthy language. Due to the previous enmity, the other accused named as Nagappan, Govindammal are assaulted the defacto complainant with hands and stone. The defacto complainant sustained injuries on head. Hence, she launched the complaint.

3. The learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is an innocent person 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.08 of 2023 for the offences under Sections 120B, 294(b), 323, 324 & 506(1) of IPC r/w section 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act, 2002, as against the petitioner. Hence he prayed to quash the same.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. side) would submit that the investigation is almost completed and the final report is yet to be filed.

5. Heard, Mr.V.Bhagiradhan, learned counsel for the petitioner and



CRL.O.P.No.9942 of 2023

Mr.N.S.Suganthan, learned Government Advocate (Crl. side) appearing for the first respondent.

6. It is seen from the First Information Report that there are specific allegations as against the petitioners to attract the offence, which has to be investigated in depth. Further the FIR is not an encyclopedia and it need not contain all facts and 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.

7. In this regard, it is 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** in the case of **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.

.....

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



CRL.O.P.No.9942 of 2023

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."

8. In view of the above discussion, this Court is not inclined to quash the First Information Report. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition stands **dismissed**. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

04.05.2023

nl

Index : Yes / No

Speaking / Non Speaking order

To

1.The Inspector of Police,



CRL.O.P.No.9942 of 2023

Chunambedu Police Station,
Chengalpet District.

WEB COPY

2. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



CRL.O.P.No.9942 of 2023

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN, J.
nl

Crl.O.P.No.9942 of 2023

04.05.2023