



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.672 of 2023

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: **12.01.2023**

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE K.MURALI SHANKAR

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.672 of 2023

and

Crl.M.P.(MD)No.614 of 2023

Arunchakkaravarthi

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.State through
The Inspector of Police,
S.S.Colony Police Station,
Madurai City.
(Crime No.2333 of 2022)

2.M.Perarasi

... Respondents

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Criminal Procedure Code, to call for the records in Crime No.2333 of 2022 on the file of the first respondent police and to quash the same in so far as the petitioner/accused No.3 concern.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Balamurugan

For R1 : Mr.M.Muthumanikkam
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.672 of 2023

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed, invoking Section 482 Cr.P.C., seeking orders to call for the records in Crime No.2333 of 2022 pending on the file of the first respondent and quash the same as against the petitioner.

2. The petitioner is the third accused in Crime No.2333 of 2022 on the file of S.S.Colony Police Station, Madurai City.

3. The second respondent has registered a case in Crime No.2333 of 2022 dated 09.12.2022 against three persons including the petitioner for the alleged offences under Sections 21(a) of Narcotic Drugs & Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 and 77 of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015.

4. The case of the prosecution is that the police officials have recovered Nitrosun-10 (Nitrazepam Tablets IP) two strip tablets without the doctor prescription from the accused 1 and 2 and that the first



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.672 of 2023

accused has given a voluntary confession statement stating that they had received the above tablets from the petitioner/third accused.

5. As rightly pointed out by the learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side), in the FIR itself, it has been stated that the second respondent has recovered the tablet prescriptions allegedly created by the petitioner to tally the accounts for the nitrozun tablets, which was given to the accused 1 and 2.

6. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the first respondent would submit that the complaint discloses cognizable offence and as such, the same has to be investigated and considering the nature of the allegations and the existence of *prima facie* case, this is not a fit case for quashing the FIR at this stage.

7. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***State of Haryana and others Vs. Bhajan Lal and others*** reported in ***1992 SCC (Cri) 426*** has enumerated 7 categories of cases, where the power can be exercised under Section 482 of Code of Criminal Procedure and the same are extracted hereunder:-



WEB COPY

“102. In the backdrop of the interpretation of the various relevant provisions of the Code under Chapter XIV and of the principles of law enunciated by this Court in a series of decisions relating to the exercise of the extraordinary power under Article 226 or the inherent powers under Section 482 of the Code which we have extracted and reproduced above, we give the following categories of cases by way of illustration wherein such power could be exercised either to prevent abuse of the process of any court or otherwise to secure the ends of justice, though it may not be possible to lay down any precise, clearly defined and sufficiently channelised and inflexible guidelines or rigid formulae and to give an exhaustive list of myriad kinds of cases wherein such power should be exercised.

(1) where the allegations made in the First Information Report or the complaint, even if they are taken at their face value and accepted in their entirety do not prima facie constitute any offence or make out a case against the accused;

(2) where the allegations in the First Information Report and other materials, if any, accompanying the F.I.R. do not disclose a cognizable offence, justifying an investigation by police officers under Section 156(1) of the



Code except under an order of a Magistrate within the purview of Section 155(2) of the Code;

(3) where the uncontroverted allegations made in the FIR or 'complaint and the evidence collected in support of the same do not disclose the commission of any offence and make out a case against the accused;

(4) where the allegations in the FIR do not constitute a cognizable offence but constitute only a non-cognizable offence, no investigation is permitted by a police officer without an order of a Magistrate as contemplated under Section 155(2) of the Code;

(5) where the allegations made in the FIR or complaint are so absurd and inherently improbable on the basis of which no prudent person can ever reach a just conclusion that there is sufficient ground for proceeding against the accused;

(6) where there is an express legal bar engrafted in any of the provisions of the Code or the concerned Act (under which a criminal proceeding is instituted) to the institution and continuance of the proceedings and/or where there is a specific provision in the Code or the concerned Act, providing efficacious redress for the grievance of the aggrieved party;



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.672 of 2023

(7) where a criminal proceeding is manifestly attended with mala fide and/or where the proceeding is maliciously instituted with an ulterior motive for wreaking vengeance on the accused and with a view to spite him due to private and personal grudge.”

8. In ***Dr.Dhruvaram Murlidhar Sonar Vs. The State of Maharashtra and others*** reported in **2019 (18) SCC 191**, the Hon'ble Apex Court has specifically held that exercise of powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C. to quash the proceedings is an exception and not a rule. It is settled law that the inherent jurisdiction under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is wide but at the same time, the same is to be exercised sparingly, carefully and with caution and only when such exercise is justified by the tests specifically laid down in the Section itself.

9. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Kaptan Singh Vs. The State of Uttar Pradesh and others*** reported in **2021 (3) Crimes 247** has stated that, that Court in catena of decisions has observed that the High Court is not required to go into the merits of the allegations and/or enter into the merits of the case as if the High Court is exercising the appellate



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.672 of 2023

jurisdiction and/or conducting the trial and that question is required to be examined keeping in view, the contents of FIR and *prima facie* materials, if any, requiring no proof and at such stage, the High Court cannot appreciate evidence nor can it draw its own inferences from contents of FIR and materials relied on.

10. It is pertinent to note that if a petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is filed at the stage of FIR, the allegations in the FIR/complaint only are required to be considered and whether a cognizable offence is disclosed or not is required to be considered.

11. In the case on hand, as rightly contended by the learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side), a cursory perusal of the FIR makes out a *prima facie* case against the accused and it is a matter for investigation and as such, the question of quashing the FIR at this stage does not arise at all. Hence, this Court concludes that this is not a fit case to invoke Section 482 Cr.P.C., for quashing the FIR at this stage and the same is liable to be dismissed.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.672 of 2023

12. In the result, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed.

Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

12.01.2023

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No
csm

To

- 1.The Inspector of Police,
S.S.Colony Police Station,
Madurai City.
- 2.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.672 of 2023



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.672 of 2023

K.MURALI SHANKAR,J.

csn

Order made in
Crl.O.P.(MD)No.672 of 2023
and
Crl.M.P.(MD)No.614 of 2023

Dated: 12.01.2023