



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.1258 of 2023

WEB COPY BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 25.01.2023

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE K.MURALI SHANKAR

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.1258 of 2023

and

Crl.M.P.(MD)No.1118 of 2023

R.Murugan

: Petitioner

Vs.

1.State represented by
The Inspector of Police,
Sempatti Police Station,
Dindigul District.
Crime No.217 of 2022.

2.Murugalakshmi

: Respondents

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Criminal Procedure Code, to call for the records in Crime No.217 of 2022, on the file of the Inspector of Police, Sempatti Police Station, Dindigul District and quash the same.



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.1258 of 2023

For Petitioner : Mrs.Sumalatha,
For Respondents : Mr.M.Muthu Manikkam,
Government Advocate (Criminal Side)
for R1.

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition filed, under Section 482 Cr.P.C., seeking orders, to call for the records in Crime No.217 of 2022, on the file of the Inspector of Police, Sempatti Police Station, Dindigul District and quash the same.

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 30.07.2022, at about 04.15 pm, when the deceased was proceeding in a two wheeler bearing Registration No.TN-39-AX-1462 in Sempatti - Oddanchathiram Road, a bus bearing Registration No. TN-57-N-2151 came in rash and negligent manner and dashed against the two wheeler and as a result of which, the two wheeler rider fell down, sustained injuries and that subsequently, he succumbed to the injuries on the way to the hospital.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.1258 of 2023

WEB COPY

3. The main contention of the petitioner is that the post-mortem report states that the deceased was under the influence of alcohol.

4. Even assuming that the deceased consumed alcohol, it is for the first respondent to decide as to whether the deceased was under the influence of alcohol and as to who was responsible for the accident and as such, the ground of intoxication cannot be considered as a reason or ground for quashing the FIR.

5. 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:-

“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



WEB COPY



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.1258 of 2023

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;



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.1258 of 2023

(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;

(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.”

6. In *Dr.Dhruvaram Murlidhar Sonar Vs. The State of Maharashtra and others* reported in 2019 (18) SCC 191, the Hon'ble Apex Court has



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.1258 of 2023

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.

7. 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 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.

8. In the case on hand, a cursory perusal of the FIR makes out a *prima facie* case to proceed against the accused. 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.1258 of 2023

WEB COPY

9. In the result, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed. The first respondent Police is directed to complete the investigation and file final report within a period of one month from the date of receipt of copy of this order. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

25.01.2023

NCC : Yes/No
Index : Yes/No
Internet : Yes/ No
das

To

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



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.1258 of 2023

K.MURALI SHANKAR,J.

das

Order made in
Crl.O.P.(MD)No.1258 of 2023
and
Crl.M.P.(MD)No.1118 of 2023

Dated: 25.01.2023