



Crl.R.C.(MD).No.1339 of 2023

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

Dated :08.12.2023

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P.VADAMALAI

Crl.R.C.(MD).No.1339 of 2023

Ragupathy

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1.The II Class Executive Magistrate Cum Thasildhar,
Dindigul District,
Dindigul West,
Dindigul District.

2.The Inspector of Police,
Rettiyar Chathiram Police Station,
Dindigul District.

3.The Superintendent,
District Jail,
Dindigul.

... Respondents

PRAYER: This Civil Revision Case is filed under Sections 397 r/w 401 of the Criminal Procedure Code, to call for the records relating to the proceedings of the first respondent in Na.Ka.No.6068/2023/A5 dated 08.11.2023 and set aside the same.



WEB COPY



Crl.R.C.(MD).No.1339 of 2023

For Petitioner : Mr.D.Venkatesh
For Respondents : Mr.K.Sanjay Gandhi
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

ORDER

This Criminal Revision is filed to call for the records relating to the proceedings of the first respondent in Na.Ka.No.6068/2023/A5 dated 08.11.2023 and set aside the same.

2. The impugned order passed by the first respondent wherein, the petitioner was arrested on 29.10.2023 and detained under Section 122(1)(b) of Cr.P.C for the violation of bond condition executed under Section 110 of Cr.P.C dated 04.07.2023, he involved in the offence after executing the bond under Section 110(e) of Cr.P.C. Aggrieved by the said order, the petitioner has preferred the present revision.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit the first respondent has no jurisdiction to pass the impugned order under Section 122 (1)(b) of Cr.P.C for which, he placed reliance of the Hon'ble Division Bench judgment in **P.Sathish @ Sathish Kumar Vs. State** reported in **2023 (1) MWN (Crl.) 499** and he seeks to set aside the impugned order.



Crl.R.C.(MD).No.1339 of 2023

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) submitted that against the above said order they are going to file SLP before the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

5. This Court considered the rival submission made by both parties.

6. The issue in this case is that *whether the first respondent has jurisdiction to pass impugned order under Section 122(1)(b) of Cr.P.C against the petitioner*. The said issue was answered by the Hon'ble Division Bench judgment in **P.Sathish @ Sathish Kumar Vs. State** reported in **2023 (1) MWN (Crl.) 499** negatively in the following terms:-

“88. Now that we have ousted the camel and put the canopy of justice back to where it belongs, our answers to the questions formulated in paragraph 2 are as under:

(a) GO.Ms. No. 659, dated 12.09.2013 and GO.Ms. No. 181, dated 20.02.2014 vesting Deputy Commissioners of Police with the powers of an Executive Magistrate for the purposes of Section 107 to 110 Cr.P.C., suffer from manifest arbitrariness and violates the principle of separation of powers under the Constitution. The GO's are consequently violative of Articles 14, 21 and 50 of the Constitution of India and the proviso to Section 6 of the Madras District Police Act. Resultantly, we declare GO.MS. No. 659, dated 12.09.2013 and GO.MS. No. 181, dated 20.02.2014 as unconstitutional and ultra



vires the aforesaid provisions. Consequently, the status quo ante that prevailed prior to the issuance of GO.MS. No. 659, dated 12.09.2013 and GO.MS. No. 181, dated 20.02.2014 stands restored forthwith.

(b) Ex-consequenti, the decision in Balamurugan v. State, MANU/TN/2058/2016, will stand overruled.

(c) Violation of a bond executed under Section 110 of the Cr.P.C., can be dealt with under Section 446 of the Code and not under Section 122(1)(b) of the Cr.P.C. Consequently, we affirm the judgment of Mr. Justice P.N. Prakash in Devi v. Executive Magistrate (MANU/TN/5284/2020 : 2020 6 CTC 157) in its entirety. The decision of the learned single judge to the contrary in Vadivel @ Mettai Vadivel v. The State (Crl.R.C. No. 982 of 2018 etc., batch) will stand overruled.

(d) GO.Ms. No. 659, dated 12.09.2013 and GO.Ms. No. 181, dated 20.02.2014 were issued only in exercise of powers under Section 20(1) of the Cr.P.C., and these Government Orders have been held to be unconstitutional. And;

(e) In the light of the law laid down in paragraph 24 of the three judge bench decision of the Supreme Court in Gulam Abbas v. State of Uttar Pradesh MANU/SC/0059/1981 : (1982) 1 SCC 71, an Executive Magistrate cannot authorize imprisonment under Section 122(1)(b) for violation of a bond under Section 107 Cr.P.C. A person who has violated the bond executed before the Executive Magistrate under the said provision will have to be challaned or prosecuted before the Judicial Magistrate for inquiry and punishment under Section 122(1)(b) Cr.P.C.”

.....

.....

92.In the light of the law declared in paragraph 88 (e),



WEB COPY



Crl.R.C.(MD).No.1339 of 2023

supra, orders passed even by the Revenue Authorities acting as Executive Magistrates, by exercising powers under Section 122(1)(b) Cr.P.C., will have to be quashed.

7.In view of the above ratio, this Court is inclined to set aside the impugned order passed by the first respondent in Na.Ka.No.6068/2023/A5 dated 08.11.2023 and accordingly, this Criminal Revision Case stands allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released forthwith, if his presence is not otherwise required in connection with any other case.

08.12.2023

Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No
tta



Crl.R.C.(MD).No.1339 of 2023

To,

WEB COPY

- 1.The II Class Executive Magistrate Cum Thasildhar,
Dindigul District,
Dindigul West,
Dindigul District.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
Rettiyar Chathiram Police Station,
Dindigul District.
- 3.The Superintendent,
District Jail,
Dindigul.
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.R.C.(MD).No.1339 of 2023

P.VADAMALAI, J

tta

Crl.R.C.(MD).No.1339 of 2023

08.12.2023