



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.12916 of 2023

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

Reserved on	10.08.2023
Delivered on	21.09.2023

CORAM

THE HON'BLE DR.JUSTICE D.NAGARJUN

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.12916 of 2023
and Crl.M.P.(MD) No.10089 of 2023

1.K.Muthuraj
2.K.Tamilselvi
3.K.Gowtham

... Petitioners/
Accused 1 - 3

Vs.

1. The Inspector of Police,
All women Police Station,
Srivilliputhur.
(Crime No.2/2023)

... 1st Respondent/Complainant

2. K.Abinaya

... 2nd Respondent /
Defacto complainant

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Criminal Procedure Code, to call for the records in Crime No.2 of 2023 on the file of the Inspector of Police, All women Police Station, Srivilliputhur and quash the same.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.12916 of 2023

For Petitioners : Mr.K.P.S.Palanivel Rajan
Senior Counsel
for M/s.K.P.S.Law Associates

For Respondents : Mr.SS.Madhavan
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)
for R1
Mr.V.Gopinath
Senior Counsel
for Mr.C.D.Johnson for R2

- - - - -

ORDER

Accused Nos.1 to 3 in Crime No.2 of 2023 have approached this Court invoking the provision under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. seeking quashment of FIR registered for the offences under Sections 498 (A), 307, 506 (2) of IPC and Section 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 and Section 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act, 2002.

2. The facts in brief are that the marriage of the first petitioner/Judicial Officer was solemnized with the defacto complainant on 13.10.2020. At the time of marriage, it was informed to the parents of the defacto complainant that the first petitioner/Accused No.1 entered into the Judicial Service at his early age of 29 years, thereby, there is a



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.12916 of 2023

possibility that he may become Judge of High Court. Accordingly, the parents of the defacto complainant offered 220 sovereigns of gold, 4 Kgs of silver, diamond necklace and other articles, at the time of marriage. The petitioners have demanded KIA limousine car from the parents of the defacto complainant whereas they offered them an Innova Crysta and spent Rs.65 lakhs towards marriage expenses.

3. Disputes arose between petitioner and defacto complainant. Hence, defacto complainant filed a complaint before learned Magistrate under Section 156 (3) of Cr.P.C., alleging that the petitioners have committed offences punishable under Sections 498 A, 307, 506 (2) of the Indian Penal Code, Section 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 and Section 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act, 2002. The Learned Magistrate referred the same to the concerned Police, who have registered a case in Crime No.2 of 2023. Aggrieved by the same, this petition is filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure seeking to quash the FIR.

4. Heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.12916 of 2023

WEB COPY

5. It is submitted by Mr.K.P.S.Palanivel Rajan, learned Senior Counsel for the petitioners that the first petitioner has been discharging the service as Judicial Officer, without any adverse remarks and the first petitioner's father had made good money and there was no necessity for them to demand dowry. It is submitted further that subsequent to marriage, the defacto complainant started persuading the first petitioner not to listen the advice of his mother/second petitioner and then she used to raise voice and tried to degrade the image of the first petitioner and the first petitioner refused to snap the relations with the second petitioner.

6. It is further submitted by the learned Senior counsel for the petitioners that the first respondent police required to hold preliminary inquiry prior to registration of a criminal case as the disputes between the petitioner and the defacto complainant is a matrimonial dispute and that the defacto complainant has not followed the procedure as contemplated by the Hon'ble Apex Court in *Priyanka Srivastava & Another v. State of U.P.*, reported in *2015 (6) SCC 287* and *Babu Venkatesh v. State of*



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.12916 of 2023

Karnataka, reported in **2022 (5) SCC 639** and thereby, registration of FIR is against the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **State of Haryana v. Bhajanlal** reported in **1992 SCC (Cri) 426**.

7. Mr.V.Gopinath, learned Senior Counsel counsel appearing for the respondent/defacto complainant submits that the FIR cannot be quashed at the threshold, unless there is strong prima facie material and that in the complaint filed against the petitioners, there are clear overt acts against all the accused persons, in respect of the offences alleged against them, thereby sought for dismissal of the petition.

8. This Court has closely gone through the contents of the FIR and found that there are specific overt acts and clear allegations against the petitioners which attracts the offences alleged against the accused for the offences under Sections 498 (A), 307, 506 (2) of the Indian Penal Code and under Section 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act, 2002. First Information Report will set a criminal law into notion in cognizable offences. FIR is not an encyclopedia to mention, describe and narrate all the incidents against the petitioners/accused. The defacto



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.12916 of 2023

complainant need not give each and every minute details of the allegations made against the petitioners/accused. Even if FIR is not clear, it is not advisable to throttle the investigation at the threshold pointing out certain lacunae in the complaint. Therefore, considering the allegations levelled by the defacto complainant in the detailed complaint, FIR cannot be quashed.

9. Normally, if a complaint is filed before the police, the police would register FIR in case cognizable offence is made out and proceed with investigation. However, in case the police fails to register FIR, the aggrieved party is expected to send a complaint to the concerned Superintendent of Police under Section 154(3) of Cr.P.C. and in case, if still there is no positive response, then the aggrieved party can file a complaint under Section 156(3) of Cr.P.C. seeking direction from the learned Magistrate Court to the police to investigate the case. However, it has become practice for most of the complainants to file before the Court directly either under Section 156(3) of Cr.P.C. or under Section 200 of Cr.P.C. without even approaching the police thereby, the Hon'ble Apex Court has passed elaborate orders in ***Priyanka Srivastava & Another v.***



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.12916 of 2023

State of U.P., reported in 2015 (6) SCC 287 and in the case of *Babu Venkatesh v. State of Karnataka*, reported in 2022 (5) SCC 639.

10. The Hon'ble Apex Court in *Priyanka Srivastava* observed as follows:-

"29. At this stage it is seemly to state that power under Section 156(3) warrants application of judicial mind. A court of law is involved. It is not the police taking steps at the stage of Section 154 of the Code. A litigant at his own whim cannot invoke the authority of the Magistrate. A principled and really grieved citizen with clean hands must have free access to invoke the said power. It protects the citizens but when pervert litigations takes this route to harass their fellow citizens, efforts are to be made to scuttle and curb the same.

30. In our considered opinion, a stage has come in this country where Section 156(3) CrPC applications are to be supported by an affidavit duly sworn by the applicant who seeks the invocation of the jurisdiction of the Magistrate. That apart, in an appropriate case, the learned Magistrate would be with Cr.M.P. No. 1596 of 2017 well advised to verify the truth and also can verify the veracity of the allegations. This affidavit can make the applicant more



responsible. We are compelled to say so as such kind of applications are being filed in a routine manner without taking any responsibility whatsoever only to harass certain persons. That apart, it becomes more disturbing and alarming when one tries to pick up people who are passing orders under a statutory provision which can be challenged under the framework of the said Act or under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. But it cannot be done to take undue advantage in a criminal court as if somebody is determined to settle the scores.

31. We have already indicated that there has to be prior applications under Sections 154(1) and 154(3) while filing a petition under Section 156(3). Both the aspects should be clearly spelt out in the application and necessary documents to that effect shall be filed. The warrant for giving a direction that an application under Section 156(3) be supported by an affidavit is so that the person making the application should be conscious and also endeavour to see that no false affidavit is made. It is because once an affidavit is found to be false, he will be liable for prosecution in accordance with law. This will deter him to casually invoke the authority of the Magistrate under Section 156(3). That apart, we have already stated that the veracity of the same can also be verified by the learned Magistrate, regard being had to the nature of allegations of the case. We are compelled to say so as a number of cases



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.12916 of 2023

pertaining to fiscal sphere, matrimonial dispute/family disputes, commercial offences, medical negligence cases, corruption cases and the cases where there is abnormal delay/laches in initiating criminal prosecution, as are illustrated in Lalita Kumari are being filed. That apart, the learned Magistrate would also be aware of the delay in lodging of the FIR."

11. In BABU VENKATESH AND OTHERS Vs. STATE OF KARNATAKA AND ANOTHER {(2022) 5 SUPREME COURT CASES 639}, it has been held as follows:-

“24. This Court has clearly held that a stage has come where applications under Section 156 (3) CrPC are to be supported by an affidavit duly sworn by the complainant who seeks the invocation of the jurisdiction of the Magistrate.

25. This Court further held that in an appropriate case, the learned Magistrate would be well advised to verify the truth



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.12916 of 2023

and also verify the veracity of the allegations. The Court has noted that applications under Section 156 (3) CrPC are filed in a routine manner without taking any responsibility only to harass certain persons.

26. This Court has further held that prior to the filing of a petition under Section 156 (3) CrPC, there have to applications under Sections 154 (1) and 154 (3) CrPC. This Court emphasises the necessity to file an affidavit so that the persons making the application should be conscious and not make false affidavit. With such a requirement, the persons would be deterred from causally invoking authority of the Magistrate, under Section 156 (3) CrPC. Inasmuch as if the affidavit is found to be false, the person would be liable for prosecution in accordance with law.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.12916 of 2023

27. In the present case, we find that the learned Magistrate while passing the order under Section 156 (3) CrPC, has totally failed to consider the law laid down by this Court.

28. From the perusal of the complaint it can be seen that the complainant respondent No.2 himself has made averments with regard to the filing of the original suit. In any case, when the complaint was not supported by an affidavit, the Magistrate ought not to have entertained the application under Section 156 (3) CrPC. The High Court has also failed to take into consideration the legal position as has been enunciated by this Court in Priyanka Srivastava Vs. State of UP and has dismissed the petitions by merely observing that serious allegations



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.12916 of 2023

are made in the complaint.

WEB COPY

29. We are therefore, of the considered view that continuation of the present proceedings would amount to nothing but an abuse of process of law.”

12. On going through the above, it is clear that without following the procedure contemplated under Section 154(3) of Cr.P.C. one cannot file complaint directly before the learned Magistrate under Section 156(3) of Cr.P.C.

13. The defacto complainant, in the case on hand, has not filed any affidavit before the learned Magistrate along with the complaint filed under Section 156 (3) of Cr.P.C. stating that the defacto complainant has sent a representation to the Superintendent of Police as required under Section 154(3) of Cr.P.C. The defacto complainant is expected to enclose the copies of receipts if any to show that representation was sent to Superintendent of Police, along with a complaint filed under Section



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.12916 of 2023

156 (3) of Cr.P.C.

WEB COPY

14. Learned Magistrate has to record his satisfaction that the directions given in *Priyanka Srivastava* and *Babu Venkatesh* have been followed prior to taking a decision for referring the complaint to the police under Section 156(3) of Cr.P.C. Therefore, in the absence of such basic requirements as mandate by the Hon'ble Apex Court the FIR shall not sustain.

15. However, considering the contents on the complaint filed before the learned Magistrate under Section 156 (3) of Cr.P.C. It is clear that there are serious and strong allegations against the accused. Quashing the FIR on technical grounds may cause lot of hardships to the defacto complainant.

16. It is also submitted that in the case of *Kaluva Kumar v. State of AP* in Criminal Petition No.4229 of 2019, dated 28.08.2019, the Andhra Pradesh High Court at Amaravathi held as under:-



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.12916 of 2023

"15. Thus, at the outset, the impugned order of the learned Magistrate in referring the complaint under Section 156(3) Cr.P.C. suffers legal infirmity for not recording reasons and therefore, consequential registration of F.I.R. basing on the impugned order is not legally sustainable and hence, the F.I.R. is liable to be quashed. In similar circumstances, in S.Purnachandra Rao's case (supra) and in Anne Srinivasa Rao's case (supra), learned Judges of this Court remanded back the matter to concerned Magistrate directing him to pass an order showing application of mind to the facts in issue while referring the case to police for investigation and to follow preconditions laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in Priyanka's case while referring the case to the concerned police for investigation. Therefore, following the afore stated precedents, similar order can be passed in the instant case.

16. In the result, this Criminal Petition is allowed and F.I.R. in Cr.No.81/2019 on the file of Nandalur Police Station, YSR Kadapa District, is quashed and the impugned order of the learned Judicial First Class Magistrate, Nandalur dated 04.06.2019 is set aside and the matter is remanded back to concerned Magistrate directing him to pass an order showing application of mind to the facts in issue. If he proposes to refer the case to police for investigation under Section 156(3) Cr.P.C., he shall direct the complainant to file sworn affidavit in the light of the



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.12916 of 2023

direction given by the Apex Court in Priyanka Srivastava's case (supra)."

17. Therefore, as observed by the High Court of Andhra Pradesh *in Kaluva Kumar v. State of AP* in Criminal Petition No.4229 of 2019, while quashing the FIR, defacto complainant shall be given liberty to file a fresh complaint before the learned Magistrate under Section 156 (3) of Cr.P.C., after complying all the requirements of *Priyanka Srivastava* and *Babu Venkatesh* (supra), so that learned Magistrate shall consider the same, record the reason and forward the same to the police for investigation.

18. In view of the above, this Criminal Original Petition is disposed of by quashing the FIR in Crime No.2 of 2023 registered against the petitioners. However, the second respondent/defacto complainant is given liberty to file a fresh complaint before the learned Magistrate under Section 156 (3) of Cr.P.C., after complying all the requirements as directed in *Priyanka Srivastava* and *Babu Venkatesh* (supra). On receipt of such complaint by the defacto complainant, learned Magistrate is directed to dispose of the same as expeditiously as



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.12916 of 2023

possible by following due process of law. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

21.09.2023

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

PKN/mvs.

To

1. The Inspector of Police,
All women Police Station,
Srivilliputhur.
2. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.12916 of 2023

DR.D.NAGARJUN,J

PKN/mvs.

Pre-delivery order made in
Crl.O.P.(MD)No.12916 of 2023

Dated: 21.09.2023