



Crl.R.C.(MD).No.518 of 2019

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

Dated : 27.11.2023

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.K.RAMAKRISHNAN

Crl.R.C(MD).No.518 of 2019

Natarajan

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The State,
Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
Vasudevanallur Police Station,
Vasudevanallur,
Tirunelveli District.
(Crime No.260/2015)

2. Sorimuthu

3.Mariyappan

4.Senthilpandi @ Senthurpandi

... Respondents

PRAYER: Criminal Revision Petition has been filed under Section 397 r/w 401 of Cr.P.C., to call for the records of the learned District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Sivagiri, in RCS. No.115 of 2018 and set aside the order dated 31.10.2018.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Balamurugan

For Respondents : Mr. E.Antony Sahaya Prabahar,
Additional Public Prosecutor for R1

: Mr.M.U.Shameem John for R2



Crl.R.C.(MD).No.518 of 2019

WEB COPY

ORDER

The petitioner herein has filed this criminal revision case against the order passed by the learned District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate, Sivagiri, in R.C.S.No.115 of 2018, dated 31.10.2018.

2.The defacto complainant is the revision petitioner. He lodged a complaint before the respondent police against the second respondent with allegation that the second respondent assaulted the defacto complainant by abusing his caste name and also criminally intimidated him. Hence, the first respondent police registered the case for the offences under Sections 447, 427, 294(b), 506(i) and Section 3(x)(i) SC/ST (P.O.A.) Act, in Crime No.260 of 2015. The first respondent police, after conducting the investigation filed the negative report, before the learned District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Sivagiri.

3.The petitioner filed a protest petition with prayer that the negative report filed by the investigating agency is liable to be set aside and suitable order for further investigation has to be ordered. The said request was declined by the learned Judicial Magistrate on the ground that the Court has no jurisdiction and also observed that the petitioner has remedy of filing private complaint.



Crl.R.C.(MD).No.518 of 2019

WEB COPY

4.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the learned Judicial Magistrate cannot hold that he has no jurisdiction to order further investigation. The learned Judicial Magistrate ought to have entertained the petition and ordered further investigation.

5.The Learned counsel for the 2nd respondent submitted that the Learned Judicial Magistrate has no jurisdiction to order further investigation and hence he rightly dismissed the petition. The Learned Judicial Magistrate also granted liberty to file private complaint and hence the petitioner's grievance is misconceived and therefore, he seeks for dismissal of the revision.

6. This court considered the rival submission made on either side and also perused the records.

7. Whether the Learned Judicial Magistrate is correct in not entertaining the petitioner's claim for further investigation without accepting the negative report filed by the investigating agency in RCS No. 115 of 2018 dated 31.10.2018.



Crl.R.C.(MD).No.518 of 2019

WEB COPY

8. Before the Schedule Caste /Schedule Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act 1989 as amended by the Schedule Caste /Schedule Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act 2015 (Act 1 of 2016), the procedure prescribed was that the investigating agency after completion of the investigation should file final report before the Learned Judicial Magistrate and the Learned Judicial Magistrate would commit the case under Section 193 of Cr.P.C., to the special court constituted to try the offence. Now there is no such requirement. In this case occurrence took place on 27.08.2015. Therefore, the petitioner made a complaint and the same was not taken on file and thereafter he filed the petition in Crl.O.P. (MD).No.20031 of 2015 before this Court and this Court issued a direction to register the case. Based on which, the FIR was registered only on 01.11.2015 in Crime No. 260 of 2015. The investigation was conducted and negative report was filed before the Learned Judicial Magistrate. Therefore, the petitioner filed protest petition with following two prayers :

8.1. To reject the negative report and direct the investigating agency to conduct further investigation.

8.2. If the learned Magistrate is not pleased to accept the above prayer to treat the protest petition as a private complaint and proceed further by examining the complainant and his witness.



Crl.R.C.(MD).No.518 of 2019

WEB COPY

9. In the petition he stated that as per the new Act, 2015, the investigating agency ought to have completed investigation within 60 days from the date of registration of the case. Further, he alleged that investigation was not done in a fair manner. The Learned Judicial Magistrate has held that he has no jurisdiction to entertain the prayer of the petitioner. In the considerable opinion of this court the order of the Learned Judicial Magistrate that he has no jurisdiction to entertain the prayer of the petitioner is correct but dismissing the petition accepting the final report is not correct. Once he held that he has no jurisdiction to entertain the prayer of the petitioner, he ought to have returned the final report filed by the investigating agency with direction to file it before the Special Court. Therefore, this Court is inclined to dispose the revision with the direction to the learned District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Sivagiri, to transfer the negative report filed in RCS No. 115 of 2018 to the Special Court for Trial under SC/ST (POA) Act Cases, Tenkasi, along with the protest petition within one month from the date of receipt of this court of the order and the Learned Special Judge is directed to act as per the parameters laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Bhagwant singh vs. Commissioner of Police*** reported in ***1985 (2) SCC 537***.



Crl.R.C.(MD).No.518 of 2019

10. Accordingly, Criminal Revision Case is allowed with the following direction:

1. The order passed by the learned District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Sivagiri, in R.C.S.No.115 of 2018 dated 31.10.2018, is set aside.

2. The learned District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Sivagiri, is hereby directed to transfer the R.C.S.No.115 of 2018 to the Special Court for Trial under SC/ST (POA) Act Cases, Tenkasi, along with the protest petition within a period of one month from the date of receipt of this Court of the order.

3. Upon the receipt of the said report, the Learned Special Judge is directed to act as per the parameters laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Bhagwant singh vs. Commissioner of Police*** reported in ***1985 (2) SCC 537*** upon giving opportunity to the petitioner within two months thereafter.

27.11.2023

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

sbn



Crl.R.C.(MD).No.518 of 2019

To

WEB COPY

1. The District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate,
Sivagiri.
2. The Trial under SC/ST (POA) Act Cases, Tenkasi.
3. The Inspector of Police,
Vasudevanallur Police Station,
Vasudevanallur, Tirunelveli District.
4. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.
5. The Section Officer,
Criminal Section(Records),
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.R.C.(MD).No.518 of 2019

K.K.RAMAKRISHNAN, J.

sbn

CrI.R.C(MD). No.518 of 2019

27.11.2023