



Crl.O.P.Nos.30320, 32090 of 2019 and 4114 of 2020

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 11.04.2023

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE **SUNDER MOHAN**

Crl.O.P.Nos.30320 & 32090 of 2019

and

Crl.O.P.No.4114 of 2020

and

Crl.M.P.Nos.16386, 16387, 17622, 17623 of 2019
and 2368 & 2370 of 2020

- 1.Ramalingam
- 2.Muruganantham
- 3.Sivaprakasam
- 4.Arumugam
- 5.Subramanian
- 6.Prabhakaran
- 7.Chandrasekaran

...Petitioners in Crl.O.P.No.30320 of 2019

- 1.Subramanian
- 2.Vadivel

...Petitioners in Crl.O.P.No.32090 of 2019

- 1.Thiyagarajan
- 2.Chinnasami
- 3.[Rasu@Raju](#)
- 4.Appavu
- 5.Gopal
- 6.Chinnappa
- 7.Ayyamperumal
- 8.Post Paramasivam
- 9.Ramasamy
- 10.Kuppusamy
- 11.Kuamur

...Petitioners in Crl.O.P.No.4114 of 2020



Crl.O.P.Nos.30320, 32090 of 2019 and 4114 of 2020

-Vs-

1.The State represented by:

Inspector of Police,
Sendurai Police Station,
Ariyalur District.

2.Periyasami

3.The Deputy Superintendent,

Ariyalur,

Ariyalur District.

... Respondents in Crl.O.P.No.30320 of 2019

R3 is impleaded as per order in

Crl.M.P.No.566 of 2020 in Crl.

O.P.No.30320 of 2019 dated 20.01.2020

1.The State represented by:

Inspector of Police,
Sendurai Police Station,
Ariyalur District.

2.Periyasami

... Respondents in Crl.O.P.No.32090 of 2019

1.The State represented by:

The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Ariyalur Sub-Division,
Ariyalur District.

2.The State represented by:

Inspector of Police,
Sendurai Police Station,
Ariyalur District.

(Crime No.318 of 2017)

3.Chandrasekar

... Respondents in Crl.O.P.No.4114 of 2020



Crl.O.P.Nos.30320, 32090 of 2019 and 4114 of 2020

Prayer in Crl.O.P.Nos.30320 & 32090 of 2019: Criminal Original petition filed under Section 482 of Code of Criminal Procedure, to call for the records relating to the proceedings in Special S.C.No.34 of 2019 on the file of the Principal District Judge, Ariyalur and to quash the same.

Prayer in Crl.O.P.No.4114 of 2020: Criminal Original petition filed under Section 482 of Code of Criminal Procedure, to call for the records relating to the proceedings in Special S.C.No.30 of 2019 on the file of the Principal District Judge and Sessions Judge, Ariyalur and to quash the same.

For Petitioners : Mr.B.Kumarasamy
for Mr.P.Paramasiva Doss
(in Crl.O.P.Nos.30320 & 32090 of 2019)

For Petitioners : Mr.R.Thirumoorthy
(in Crl.O.P.No.4114 of 2020)

For R1 & R3 : Mr.A.Damodaran,
(in Crl.O.P.No.30320 of 2019) Additional Public Prosecutor
For R1 in Crl.O.P.No.32090 of 2019
For R1 & R2 in Crl.O.P.No.4114 of 2020

For R2 in Crl.O.P.No.30320 of 2019 : No appearance

For R2 in Crl.O.P.No.32090 of 2019 : No appearance

For R3 in Crl.O.P.No.4114 of 2020 : No appearance



Crl.O.P.Nos.30320, 32090 of 2019 and 4114 of 2020

COMMON ORDER

WEB COPY Crl.O.P.Nos.30320 & 32090 of 2019 have been filed seeking to quash the proceedings in Special S.C.No.34 of 2019 on the file of the Principal District Court, Ariyalur, filed for the alleged offences under Sections 147, 148, 294(b), 323, 324, 506(ii) of IPC and Sections 3(1)(r), 3(1)(s) and 3(2)(va) of the Scheduled Caste and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention and Atrocities) Amendment Act, 2015.

2.Crl.O.P.No.4114 of 2020 have been filed seeking to quash the proceedings in Special S.C.No.30 of 2019 on the file of the Principal District Court, Ariyalur, filed for the alleged offences under Sections 147, 148, 294(b), 323, 324, 506(ii) of IPC and Sections 3(1)(r), 3(1)(s) and 3(2)(va) of the Scheduled Caste and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention and Atrocities) Amendment Act, 2015.

3.The learned counsel for the petitioners in Crl.O.P.Nos.30320 and 32090 of 2019 submitted that the impugned proceedings are liable to be quashed, since the Investigation Officer after conducting investigation, in the case registered against the petitioners and the case filed by the petitioners, has filed final report in both the cases; that this is in violation of the settled position of law; that when there is a case in counter case, it



Crl.O.P.Nos.30320, 32090 of 2019 and 4114 of 2020

the duty of the Investigation Officer to find out as to who is the aggressor and file final report only against the aggressor; and that if the Investigation Officer is unable to find out, as to who is the aggressor, then action has to be dropped against the accused in both cases.

4.The learned counsel for the petitioner in Crl.O.P.No.4114 of 2020 also submitted that the respondent police ought not to have filed final report in both the complaints.

5.It is seen that for the very same occurrence one of the petitioners in Crl.O.P.No.30320 of 2019 and the 3rd respondent in other Crl.O.P.No.4114 of 2020 had given the complaints. This has resulted in filing of two final reports. The investigation was conducted by the very same Investigation Officer in both the cases. It is the matter of common sense, that when there are two versions with regard to the same occurrence both cannot be true. Either one has to be true or both has to be false. That is the reason for the procedure that is laid down in order 566 of the Police Standing Orders, where there are clear instructions to the Investigation Officer, as to how to deal with the cases and counter



Crl.O.P.Nos.30320, 32090 of 2019 and 4114 of 2020

cases.

WEB COPY

6. In the instant case, the said procedure has been violated. This

Court in ***Vellapandy Thevar and Others Vs. State rep.by the Inspector of Police, Alangulam Police Station, Tirunelveli Dt., reported in [1984 LW (Crl.) 257]*** had held as follows:

4. This is a case of complaint and counter complaint. On the complaint given by Tmt. Ramasundaram in Cr. No. 64 of 1982, the Inspector of Police has filed a charge sheet in S.C. 132 of 1983 for offences under Sections 147, 148, 427, 324 and 302, Indian Penal Code against the Petitioners in Crl. M.P. 5503 of 1984. In respect of the same incident, Tmt. Thangathai has given a complaint in Crime No. 65 of 1983 and the Inspector of Police has filed a charge -sheet in respect thereof against the Petitioners in Crl. M.P. 4437 of 1983, under Sections 147, 148, 427, 337 and 307, Indian Penal Code now pending in S.C. 151 of 1983 on the file of the Assistant



WEB COPY



CrI.O.P.Nos.30320, 32090 of 2019 and 4114 of 2020

Sessions Judge. Tenkasi. In cases of complaints and counter complaints, the procedure to be followed by the Investigating Officer is laid down in Order 588 -A of the Madras Police Standing Orders, which is as follows:

“588 -A. Charge sheets in cases and counter cases: In a complaint and counter complaint obviously arising out of the same transaction the investigating officer should enquire into both of them and adopt one or the other of the two courses, viz, (1) to charge the case where the accused were the aggressors or (2) to refer both the cases if he should find them untrue. When the investigating officer proceeds on the basis of the complaint it is his duty to exhibit the counter complaint in the court and also to prove medical certificates of persons wounded on the opposite side. He should place before court a definite case which he makes it to



WEB COPY



CrI.O.P.Nos.30320, 32090 of 2019 and 4114 of 2020

accept. The investigating officer in such cases should not accept in to do one complaint and examine only witnesses who support it and give no explanation at all for the injuries caused to the other side. The truth in these cases is invariably not in strict conformity with either complaint and it is quite "necessary that all the facts are placed before the court to enable it to arrive at the truth and a just decision.

If the investigating officer finds that the choice of either course is difficult, viz, to charge one of the two cases or to throw out both, he should seek the opinion of the Public Prosecutor of the District and act accordingly. A final report should be sent in respect of the case referred as mistake of law and the complainant or the counter complaint, as the case may be should be advised about the disposal by a notice in P. 96 and to seek remedy before the specified



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.Nos.30320, 32090 of 2019 and 4114 of 2020

magistrate, if he is aggrieved by the disposal of the same by the police”.

The investigating officer has to enquire into both the complaints, find out who were the aggressors and file a charge sheet against them or refer both the cases if he finds them untrue. Where the investigating officer finds it difficult to choose either of the above courses, he should seek the opinion of the Public Prosecutor and act accordingly. In the instant case, the Inspector of Police has referred the matter to the Public Prosecutor and the Public Prosecutor has advised the filing of the charge sheet only against the Petitioners in Crl. M.P. 5503 of 1984, and not against the Petitioners in Crl. M.P. 4057 of 1983. But the Inspector of Police has not acted according to the opinion of the Public Prosecutor and filed a charge sheet against both the groups. This is certainly not in accord with Order 538 -A



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.Nos.30320, 32090 of 2019 and 4114 of 2020

of the Madras Police Standing Orders. The investigating officer ought to have filed the charge sheet Only in Crl. No. 64 of 1982 against the Petitioners in Crl. M.P. 5503 of 1684, which is now pending in the court of the II Additional Sessions Judge, Tirunelveli in S.C. 132 of 1983 for offences under Sections 147, 148, 427, 324 and 302 Indian Penal Code and must have referred the complaint given by Thangathai registered in Cr. No. 69 of 1982, instead of filing another charge sheet in the said crime number against the Petitioners in Cr. M.P. 4437 of 1983, which is now pending in the court of the Assistant Sessions Judge, Tenkasi in S.C. 151 of 1983, for offences under Sections 147, 148, 427, 337, and 307, Indian Penal Code The investigating officer has evidently contravened the express provision of the Order 588 -A which lays down that in the case of doubt he ought to refer the matter to the



WEB COPY



CrI.O.P.Nos.30320, 32090 of 2019 and 4114 of 2020

opinion of the Public Prosecutor and act accordingly. The investigating officer has referred the matter to the opinion of the Public Prosecutor, but has failed to act accordingly. The result is there are now two Prosecutions in respect of the same matter against the opposite parties.;

5.As pointed out by this Court in Thota Ramakrishna and others .Vs. State.

“It is improper for the police to prosecute the same time two counter cases in regard to the same occurrence one of which must be false. It is improper also and disrespectful to the court for the Public Prosecutor to conduct both cases in the sessions court knowing that one must be false. Such counter cases cannot both the prosecuted honestly either by the police or the public prosecutor”.

7.This Court on a reading of the final report finds that in view of



CrI.O.P.Nos.30320, 32090 of 2019 and 4114 of 2020

the two final reports, prejudice has been caused to both the parties.

Therefore, this Court is of the view, for all the above reasons that both the impugned final reports in Special S.C.Nos.30 of 2019 and 34 of 2019 on the file of the Principal District Court, Ariyalur, are liable to be quashed, as there cannot be two final reports giving contrary versions for the same incident. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petitions are allowed. Consequently, connected Criminal Miscellaneous Petitions closed.

11.04.2023

smv

Index : Yes/No

Speaking : Yes / No

Neutral Citation : Yes / No

To,

1.The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Ariyalur Sub-Division,
Ariyalur District.

2.The Inspector of Police,
Sendurai Police Station,
Ariyalur District.

3.The learned Principal and Sessions Judge, Ariyalur.

SUNDER MOHAN,J.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.Nos.30320, 32090 of 2019 and 4114 of 2020

smv

Crl.O.P.Nos.30320 & 32090 of 2019
and
Crl.O.P.No.4114 of 2020
and
Crl.M.P.Nos.16386, 16387, 17622, 17623 of 2019
and 2368 & 2370 of 2020

11.04.2023