

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
Criminal Revisional Jurisdiction
APPELLATE SIDE

Present:

The Hon'ble Justice Shampa Dutt (Paul)

CRR 3337 of 2022

With

CRAN 2 of 2024

Chetak Enterprises Ltd. & ors.

-Vs-

The State of West Bengal & Anr.

For the Petitioners : Mr. Sandipan Ganguly, Sr. Advocate
Ms. Manaswita Mukherjee,
Mr. Aamir Zafar Khan,
Ms. S. Chatterjee.

For the State : None.

For the Opposite Party No. 2 : None.

Hearing concluded on : 06.12.2024

Judgment on : 23.12.2024

Shampa Dutt (Paul), J.:

1. The present revisional application has been preferred praying for quashing of the proceedings being CNS No. 195 of 2018 registered for offence punishable under Section 420/120B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, now pending before the Court of the Learned Metropolitan Magistrate, 19th Court at Calcutta.

2. By the petition of complaint before the learned Magistrate the complainant herein initiated the proceedings against the accused persons herein who admittedly reside outside the jurisdiction of the trial Court.
3. The complainant/opposite party in spite of being served has failed to appear during the hearing of the present case.
4. By the order dated 14.01.2020 in CNS 195 of 2018 the learned Magistrate issued process. It appears that prima facie the mandatory provision of Section 202 of Cr. P.C. has not been complied with.
5. **Section 202 Cr.P.C. lays down:-**

“202. Postponement of issue of process. -

(1) Any Magistrate, on receipt of a complaint of an offence of which he is authorised to take cognizance or which has been made over to him under section 192, may, if he thinks fit, [and shall, in a case where the accused is residing at a place beyond the area in which he exercises his jurisdiction] postpone the issue of process against the accused, and either inquire into the case himself or direct an investigation to be made by a police officer or by such other person as he thinks fit, for the purpose of deciding whether or not there is sufficient ground for proceeding:

Provided that no such direction for investigation shall be made,--

(a) where it appears to the Magistrate that the offence complained of is triable exclusively by the Court of Session; or

(b) where the complaint has not been made by a Court, unless the complainant and the witnesses

present (if any) have been examined on oath under section 200.

(2) In an inquiry under sub- section (1), the Magistrate may, if he thinks fit, take evidence of witnesses on oath:

Provided that if it appears to the Magistrate that the offence complained of is triable exclusively by the Court of Session, he shall call upon the complainant to produce all his witnesses and examine them on oath.

(3) If an investigation under sub- section (1) is made by a person not being a police officer, he shall have for that investigation all the powers conferred by this Code on an officer- in- charge of a police station except the power to arrest without warrant.”

6. In **Vijay Dhanuka and Ors. vs Najima Mamtaj and Ors., (2014)**

14 SCC 638, on March 27, 2014, the Supreme Court held:-

“11. Section 202 of the Code, *inter alia*, contemplates postponement of the issue of the process “in a case where the accused is residing at a place beyond the area in which he exercises his jurisdiction” and thereafter to either inquire into the case by himself or direct an investigation to be made by a police officer or by such other person as he thinks fit. In the face of it, what needs our determination is as to whether in a case where the accused is residing at a place beyond the area in which the Magistrate exercises his jurisdiction, inquiry is mandatory or not.

12. The words “and shall, in a case where the accused is residing at a place beyond the area in which he exercises his jurisdiction” were inserted by Section 19 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Act (Central Act 25 of 2005) *w.e.f.* 23-6-2006. The aforesaid amendment, in the opinion of the legislature, was essential as false complaints are filed against persons residing at far off places in order to harass them. The note for the amendment reads as follows:

“False complaints are filed against persons residing at far off places simply to harass them. In order to see that innocent persons are not harassed by unscrupulous persons, this clause seeks to amend sub-section (1) of Section 202 to make it obligatory upon the Magistrate that before summoning the accused residing beyond his jurisdiction he shall enquire into the case himself or direct investigation to be made by a police officer or by such other person as he thinks fit, for finding out whether or not there was sufficient ground for proceeding against the accused.”

The use of the expression “shall” prima facie makes the inquiry or the investigation, as the case may be, by the Magistrate mandatory. The word “shall” is ordinarily mandatory but sometimes, taking into account the context or the intention, it can be held to be directory. The use of the word “shall” in all circumstances is not decisive. Bearing in mind the aforesaid principle, when we look to the intention of the legislature, we find that it is aimed to prevent innocent persons from harassment by unscrupulous persons from false complaints. Hence, in our opinion, the use of the expression “shall” and the background and the purpose for which the amendment has been brought, we have no doubt in our mind that inquiry or the investigation, as the case may be, is mandatory before summons are issued against the accused living beyond the territorial jurisdiction of the Magistrate.

13. *In view of the decision of this Court in Udai Shankar Awasthi v. State of U.P. [(2013) 2 SCC 435 : (2013) 1 SCC (Civ) 1121 : (2013) 2 SCC (Cri) 708] , this point need not detain us any further as in the said case, this Court has clearly held that the provision aforesaid is mandatory. It is apt to reproduce the following passage from the said judgment: (SCC p. 449, para 40)*

“40. The Magistrate had issued summons without meeting the mandatory requirement of Section 202 CrPC, though the appellants were outside his territorial jurisdiction. The provisions of Section 202 CrPC were amended vide the Amendment Act, 2005, making it [Ed.: The matter between the two asterisks has been emphasised in original as well.] mandatory to postpone the issue of process [Ed.: The matter between the two asterisks has been emphasised in original as well.] where

the accused resides in an area beyond the territorial jurisdiction of the Magistrate concerned. The same was found necessary in order to protect innocent persons from being harassed by unscrupulous persons and making it obligatory upon the Magistrate to enquire into the case himself, or to direct investigation to be made by a police officer, or by such other person as he thinks fit for the purpose of finding out whether or not, there was sufficient ground for proceeding against the accused before issuing summons in such cases.”

(emphasis supplied)

14. *In view of our answer to the aforesaid question, the next question which falls for our determination is whether the learned Magistrate before issuing summons has held the inquiry as mandated under Section 202 of the Code. The word “inquiry” has been defined under Section 2(g) of the Code, the same reads as follows:*

“2. (g) ‘inquiry’ means every inquiry, other than a trial, conducted under this Code by a Magistrate or court;”

It is evident from the aforesaid provision, every inquiry other than a trial conducted by the Magistrate or the court is an inquiry. No specific mode or manner of inquiry is provided under Section 202 of the Code. In the inquiry envisaged under Section 202 of the Code, the witnesses are examined whereas under Section 200 of the Code, examination of the complainant only is necessary with the option of examining the witnesses present, if any. This exercise by the Magistrate, for the purpose of deciding whether or not there is sufficient ground for proceeding against the accused, is nothing but an inquiry envisaged under Section 202 of the Code.”

7. In **2018(3) AICLR 625(Cal.), S.S. Binu vs. State of West Bengal (Cal.)**, the court held:-

“100. To sum up, the reference made by the Learned Single Judge on the five issues are answered as follows:-

I. According to the settled principles of law, the amendment of sub-section (1) of Section 202 Cr.P.C. by virtue of Section 19 of the Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Act, 2005, is aimed to prevent innocent persons, who are residing outside the territorial jurisdiction of the Learned Magistrate concerned, from harassment by unscrupulous persons from false complaints. The use of expression "shall", looking to the intention of the legislature to the context, is mandatory before summons are issued against the accused living beyond the territorial jurisdiction of the Magistrate.

II. Keeping in mind the object sought to be achieved by way of amendment of sub-section (1) of Section 202 Cr.P.C., the nature of enquiry as indicated in Section 19 of the Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Act, 2005, the Magistrate concerned is to ward off false complaints against such persons who reside at far off places with a view to save them from unnecessary harassment and the Learned Magistrate concerned is under obligation to find out if there is any matter which calls for investigation by Criminal Court in the light of the settled principles of law holding an enquiry by way of examining the witnesses produced by the complainant or direct an investigation made by a police officer as discussed hereinabove.

III. When an order of issuing summon is issued by a learned Magistrate against an accused who is residing at a place beyond the area in which he exercises his jurisdiction without conducting an enquiry under Section 202 Cr.P.C., the matter is required to be remitted to the learned Magistrate concerned for passing fresh orders uninfluenced by the prima facie conclusion reached by the Appellate Court.

IV. Keeping in mind the object underlined in Section 465 Cr.P.C. that if on any technical ground any party to the criminal proceedings is aggrieved he must raise the objection thereof at the earliest stage. In the event of failure on the part of an aggrieved party to raise objection at the earliest stage, he cannot be heard on that aspect after the whole trial is over or even at a later stage after his participation in the trial.

V. In cases falling under Section 138 read with Section 141 of the N.I.Act, the Magistrate is not mandatorily required to comply with the provisions of Section 202 (1) before issuing summons to an accused residing outside the territorial jurisdiction of the learned Magistrate concerned.”

8. This Court also relies upon the case of ***Birla Corporation Ltd. vs. Adventz Investments and Holdings (Criminal appeal No. 875, 876, 877 of 2019)***. The Supreme Court on 9th May, 2019 observed and held in respect of Section 202 Cr.P.C. as follows (The relevant paragraph are reproduced herein):-

26. *Complaint filed under Section 200 Cr.P.C. and enquiry contemplated under Section 202 Cr.P.C. and issuance of process:- Under Section 200 of the Criminal Procedure Code, on presentation of the complaint by an individual, the Magistrate is required to examine the complainant and the witnesses present, if any. Thereafter, on perusal of the allegations made in the complaint, the statement of the complainant on solemn affirmation and the witnesses examined, the Magistrate has to get himself satisfied that there are sufficient grounds for proceeding against the accused and on such satisfaction, the Magistrate may direct for issuance of process as contemplated under Section 204 Cr.P.C. The purpose of the enquiry under Section 202 Cr.P.C. is to determine whether a prima facie case is made out and whether there is sufficient ground for proceeding against the accused.*

27. *The scope of enquiry under this section is extremely restricted only to finding out the truth or otherwise of the allegations made in the complaint in order to determine whether process should be issued or not under Section 204 Cr.P.C. or whether the complaint should be dismissed by resorting to Section 203 Cr.P.C. on the footing that there is no sufficient ground for proceeding on the basis of the statements of the complainant and of his witnesses, if any. At the*

stage of enquiry under Section 202 Cr.P.C., the Magistrate is only concerned with the allegations made in the complaint or the evidence in support of the averments in the complaint to satisfy himself that there is sufficient ground for proceeding against the accused.

28. *In National Bank of Oman v. Barakara Abdul Aziz and Another (2013) 2 SCC 488, the Supreme Court explained the scope of enquiry and held as under:-*

“9. The duty of a Magistrate receiving a complaint is set out in Section 202 CrPC and there is an obligation on the Magistrate to find out if there is any matter which calls for investigation by a criminal court. The scope of enquiry under this section is restricted only to find out the truth or otherwise of the allegations made in the complaint in order to determine whether process has to be issued or not. Investigation under Section 202 CrPC is different from the investigation contemplated in Section 156 as it is only for holding the Magistrate to decide whether or not there is sufficient ground for him to proceed further. The scope of enquiry under Section 202 CrPC is, therefore, limited to the ascertainment of truth or falsehood of the allegations made in the complaint:

(i) on the materials placed by the complainant before the court;

(ii) for the limited purpose of finding out whether a prima facie case for issue of process has been made out; and

(iii) for deciding the question purely from the point of view of the complainant without at all adverting to any defence that the accused may have.”

29. *In Mehmood Ul Rehman v. Khazir Mohammad Tunda and Others (2015) 12 SCC 420, the scope of enquiry under Section 202 Cr.P.C. and the satisfaction of the Magistrate for issuance of process has been considered and held as under:-*

“2. Chapter XV Cr.P.C. deals with the further procedure for dealing with “Complaints to Magistrate”. Under Section 200 Cr.P.C, the Magistrate, taking cognizance of an offence on a complaint, shall examine upon oath the complainant and the witnesses, if any, present and the substance of such examination should be reduced to writing and the same shall be signed by the complainant, the witnesses and the Magistrate. Under Section 202 Cr.P.C, the Magistrate, if required, is empowered to either inquire into the case himself or direct an investigation to be made by a competent person “for the purpose of deciding whether or not there is sufficient ground for proceeding”. If, after considering the statements recorded under Section 200 Cr.P.C and the result of the inquiry or investigation under Section 202 Cr.P.C, the Magistrate is of the opinion that there is no sufficient ground for proceeding, he should dismiss the complaint, after briefly recording the reasons for doing so.

3. Chapter XVI Cr.P.C deals with “Commencement of Proceedings before Magistrate”. If, in the opinion of the Magistrate taking cognizance of an offence, there is sufficient ground for proceeding, the Magistrate has to issue process under Section 204(1) Cr.P.C for attendance of the accused.”

30. *Reiterating the mandatory requirement of application of mind in the process of taking cognizance, in Bhushan Kumar and Another v. State (NCT of Delhi) and Another (2012) 5 SCC 424, it was held as under:-*

“11. In Chief Enforcement Officer v. Videocon International Ltd. (2008) 2 SCC 492 (SCC p. 499, para 19) the expression “cognizance” was explained by this Court as “it merely means ‘become aware of’ and when used with reference to a court or a Judge, it connotes ‘to take notice of judicially’. It indicates the point when a court

or a Magistrate takes judicial notice of an offence with a view to initiating proceedings in respect of such offence said to have been committed by someone.” It is entirely a different thing from initiation of proceedings; rather it is the condition precedent to the initiation of proceedings by the Magistrate or the Judge. Cognizance is taken of cases and not of persons. Under Section 190 of the Code, it is the application of judicial mind to the averments in the complaint that constitutes cognizance. At this stage, the Magistrate has to be satisfied whether there is sufficient ground for proceeding and not whether there is sufficient ground for conviction. Whether the evidence is adequate for supporting the conviction can be determined only at the trial and not at the stage of enquiry. If there is sufficient ground for proceeding then the Magistrate is empowered for issuance of process under Section 204 of the Code.”

31. *Under the amended sub-section (1) to Section 202 Cr.P.C., it is obligatory upon the Magistrate that before summoning the accused residing beyond its jurisdiction, he shall enquire into the case himself or direct the investigation to be made by a police officer or by such other person as he thinks fit for finding out whether or not there is sufficient ground for proceeding against the accused.*

32. *By Cr.P.C. (Amendment) Act, 2005, in Section 202 Cr.P.C. of the Principal Act with effect from 23.06.2006, in sub-section (1), the words “...and shall, in a case where accused is residing at a place beyond the area in which he exercises jurisdiction...” were inserted by Section 19 of the Criminal Procedure Code (Amendment) Act, 2005. In the opinion of the legislature, such amendment was necessary as false complaints are filed against persons residing at far off places in order to harass them. The object of the amendment is to ensure that persons residing at far off places are not harassed by filing false complaints making it obligatory for the*

Magistrate to enquire. Notes on Clause 19 reads as under:-

“False complaints are filed against persons residing at far off places simply to harass them. In order to see that the innocent persons are not harassed by unscrupulous persons, this clause seeks to amend sub-section (1) of Section 202 to make it obligatory upon the Magistrate that before summoning the accused residing beyond his jurisdiction he shall enquire into the case himself or direct investigation to be made by a police officer or by such other person as he thinks fit, for finding out whether or not there was sufficient ground for proceeding against the accused.”

33. *Considering the scope of amendment to Section 202 Cr.P.C., in Vijay Dhanuka and Others v. Najima Mamta and Others (2014) 14 SCC 638, it was held as under:-*

“12.The use of the expression “shall” prima facie makes the inquiry or the investigation, as the case may be, by the Magistrate mandatory. The word “shall” is ordinarily mandatory but sometimes, taking into account the context or the intention, it can be held to be directory. The use of the word “shall” in all circumstances is not decisive. Bearing in mind the aforesaid principle, when we look to the intention of the legislature, we find that it is aimed to prevent innocent persons from harassment by unscrupulous persons from false complaints. Hence, in our opinion, the use of the expression “shall” and the background and the purpose for which the amendment has been brought, we have no doubt in our mind that inquiry or the investigation, as the case may be, is mandatory before summons are issued against the accused living beyond the territorial jurisdiction of the Magistrate.” Since the amendment is aimed to prevent persons residing outside the jurisdiction of the court from being harassed, it was reiterated that holding of

enquiry is mandatory. The purpose or objective behind the amendment was also considered by this Court in Abhijit Pawar v. Hemant Madhukar Nimbalkar and Another (2017) 3 SCC 528 and National Bank of Oman v. Barakara Abdul Aziz and Another (2013) 2 SCC 488.

34. *The order of the Magistrate summoning the accused must reflect that he has applied his mind to the facts of the case and the law applicable thereto. The application of mind has to be indicated by disclosure of mind on the satisfaction. Considering the duties on the part of the Magistrate for issuance of summons to accused in a complaint case and that there must be sufficient indication as to the application of mind and observing that the Magistrate is not to act as a post office in taking cognizance of the complaint, in Mehmood Ul Rehman, this Court held as under:- “22.the Code of Criminal Procedure requires speaking order to be passed under Section 203 Cr.P.C. when the complaint is dismissed and that too the reasons need to be stated only briefly. In other words, the Magistrate is not to act as a post office in taking cognizance of each and every complaint filed before him and issue process as a matter of course. There must be sufficient indication in the order passed by the Magistrate that he is satisfied that the allegations in the complaint constitute an offence and when considered along with the statements recorded and the result of inquiry or report of investigation under Section 202 Cr.P.C., if any, the accused is answerable before the criminal court, there is ground for proceeding against the accused under Section 204 Cr.P.C., by issuing process for appearance. The application of mind is best demonstrated by disclosure of mind on the satisfaction. If there is no such indication in a case where the Magistrate proceeds under Sections 190/204 Cr.P.C., the High Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is bound to invoke its inherent power in order to prevent abuse of the power of the criminal court. To be called to appear before the criminal court as an accused is serious matter affecting one’s dignity, self-respect and image in*

society. Hence, the process of criminal court shall not be made a weapon of harassment.”

35. In *Pepsi Foods Ltd. and Another v. Special Judicial Magistrate and Others* (1998) 5 SCC 749, the Supreme Court has held that summoning of an accused in a criminal case is a serious matter and that the order of the Magistrate summoning the accused must reflect that he has applied his mind to the facts of the case and law governing the issue. In para (28), it was held as under:-

“28. Summoning of an accused in a criminal case is a serious matter. Criminal law cannot be set into motion as a matter of course. It is not that the complainant has to bring only two witnesses to support his allegations in the complaint to have the criminal law set into motion. **The order of the Magistrate summoning the accused must reflect that he has applied his mind to the facts of the case and the law applicable thereto.** He has to examine the nature of allegations made in the complaint and the evidence both oral and documentary in support thereof and would that be sufficient for the complainant to succeed in bringing charge home to the accused. It is not that the Magistrate is a silent spectator at the time of recording of preliminary evidence before summoning of the accused. The Magistrate has to carefully scrutinise the evidence brought on record and may even himself put questions to the complainant and his witnesses to elicit answers to find out the truthfulness of the allegations or otherwise and then examine if any offence is *prima facie* committed by all or any of the accused.” The principle that summoning an accused in a criminal case is a serious matter and that as a matter of course, the criminal case against a person cannot be set into motion was reiterated in *GHCL Employees Stock Option Trust v. India Infoline Limited* (2013) 4 SCC 505.

36. *To be summoned/to appear before the Criminal Court as an accused is a serious matter affecting one's dignity and reputation in the society. In taking recourse to such a serious matter in summoning the accused in a case filed on a complaint otherwise than on a police report, there has to be application of mind as to whether the allegations in the complaint constitute essential ingredients of the offence and whether there are sufficient grounds for proceeding against the accused. In Punjab National Bank and Others v. Surendra Prasad Sinha 1993 Supp (1) SCC 499, it was held that the issuance of process should not be mechanical nor should be made an instrument of oppression or needless harassment.*

37. *At the stage of issuance of process to the accused, the Magistrate is not required to record detailed orders. But based on the allegations made in the complaint or the evidence led in support of the same, the Magistrate is to be prima facie satisfied that there are sufficient grounds for proceeding against the accused. In Jagdish Ram v. State of Rajasthan and Another (2004) 4 SCC 432, it was held as under:-*

“10.The taking of cognizance of the offence is an area exclusively within the domain of a Magistrate. At this stage, the Magistrate has to be satisfied whether there is sufficient ground for proceeding and not whether there is sufficient ground for conviction. Whether the evidence is adequate for supporting the conviction, can be determined only at the trial and not at the stage of inquiry. At the stage of issuing the process to the accused, the Magistrate is not required to record reasons.”

56. *As held in Chandra Deo Singh v. Prokash Chandra Bose alias Chabi Bose and Another AIR 1963 SC 1430 and in a series of judgments of the Supreme Court, the object of an enquiry under Section 202 Cr.P.C. is for the Magistrate to scrutinize the material produced by the complainant to satisfy himself that the complaint is not frivolous and that there is*

evidence/material which forms sufficient ground for the Magistrate to proceed to issue process under Section 204 Cr.P.C. It is the duty of the Magistrate to elicit every fact that would establish the bona fides of the complaint and the complainant.

60.....*The Magistrate who is conducting an investigation under Section 202 Cr.P.C. has full power in collecting the evidence and examining the matter. We are conscious that once the Magistrate is exercised his discretion, it is not for the Sessions Court or the High Court to substitute its own discretion for that of the Magistrate to examine the case on merits. The Magistrate may not embark upon detailed enquiry or discussion of the merits/demerits of the case. But the Magistrate is required to consider whether a prima case has been made out or not and apply the mind to the materials before satisfying himself that there are sufficient grounds for proceeding against the accused.....*

61. The object of investigation under Section 202 Cr.P.C. is “for the purpose of deciding whether or not there is sufficient ground for proceeding”. The enquiry under Section 202 Cr.P.C. is to ascertain the fact whether the complaint has any valid foundation calling for issuance of process to the person complained against or whether it is a baseless one on which no action need be taken. The law imposes a serious responsibility on the Magistrate to decide if there is sufficient ground for proceeding against the accused. The issuance of process should not be mechanical nor should be made as an instrument of harassment to the accused. As discussed earlier, issuance of process to the accused calling upon them to appear in the criminal case is a serious matter and lack of

material particulars and non-application of mind as to the materials cannot be brushed aside on the ground that it is only a procedural irregularity.....”

9. **Thus it is clear** that Section 202 Cr.P.C. makes it obligatory upon the Magistrate that before summoning the **accused residing beyond** his jurisdiction he shall inquire into the case himself or direct investigation to be made by a Police Officer or by such other person as he thinks fit, for finding out **whether or not there is sufficient ground for proceeding against the accused.**

10. In ***Sunil Todi and Ors. vs State of Gujarat and Anr., Criminal Appeal No. 1446 of 2021, on 03.12.2021***, the Supreme Court held:-

“31. The second submission which has been urged on behalf of the appellants turns upon Section 202 CrPC, which is extracted:

“202. Postponement of issue of process.—(1) Any Magistrate, on receipt of a complaint of an offence of which he is authorised to take cognizance or which has been made over to him under section 192, may, if he thinks fit, 1 [and shall, in a case where the accused is residing at a place beyond the area in which he exercises his jurisdiction,] postpone the issue of process against the accused, and either inquire into the case himself or direct an investigation to be made by a police officer or by such other person as he thinks fit, for the purpose of deciding whether or not there is sufficient ground for proceeding:

Provided that no such direction for investigation shall be made,— (a) where it appears to the Magistrate that the offence complained of is triable exclusively by the Court of Session; or (b) where the complaint has not been made by a Court, unless the complainant and the witnesses present (if any) have been examined on oath under section 200.

(2) In an inquiry under sub-section (1), the Magistrate may, if he thinks fit, take evidence of witnesses on oath: Provided that if it appears to the Magistrate that the

offence complained of is triable exclusively by the Court of Session, he shall call upon the complainant to produce all his witnesses and examine them on oath.

(3) If an investigation under sub-section (1) is made by a person not being a police officer, he shall have for that investigation all the powers conferred by this Code on an officer in charge of a police station except the power to arrest without warrant.”

32.

33. The provisions of Section 202 which mandate the Magistrate, in a case where the accused is residing at a place beyond the area of its jurisdiction, to postpone the issuance of process so as to enquire into the case himself or direct an investigation by police officer or by another person were introduced by Act 25 of 2005 with effect from 23 June 2006. The rationale for the amendment is based on the recognition by Parliament that false complaints are filed against persons residing at far off places as an instrument of harassment. In **Vijay Dhanuka v. Najima Mamtaj**²⁰, this Court dwelt on the purpose of the amendment to Section 202, observing:

“11. Section 202 of the Code, inter alia, contemplates postponement of the issue of the process ‘in a case where the accused is residing at a place beyond the area in which he exercises his jurisdiction’ and thereafter to either inquire into the case by himself or direct an investigation to be made by a police officer or by such other person as he thinks fit. In the face of it, what needs our determination is as to whether in a case where the accused is residing at a place beyond the area in which the Magistrate exercises his jurisdiction, inquiry is mandatory or not.

12. The words ‘and shall, in a case where the accused is residing at a place beyond the area in which he exercises his jurisdiction’ were inserted by Section 19 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Act (Central Act 25 of 2005) w.e.f. 23-6-2006. The aforesaid amendment, in the opinion of the legislature, was essential as false complaints are filed against persons residing at far-off places in order to harass them. The note for the amendment reads as follows:

‘False complaints are filed against persons residing at far-off places simply to harass them. In order to see that innocent persons are not harassed by unscrupulous persons, this clause seeks to amend sub-section (1) of Section 202 to make it obligatory upon the Magistrate

that before summoning the accused residing beyond his jurisdiction he shall enquire into the case himself or direct investigation to be made by a police officer or by such other person as he thinks fit, for finding out whether or not there was sufficient ground for proceeding against the accused.'

The use of the expression "shall" prima facie makes the inquiry or the investigation, as the case may be, by the Magistrate mandatory. The word "shall" is ordinarily mandatory but sometimes, taking into account the context or the intention, it can be held to be directory. The use of the word "shall" in all circumstances is not decisive. Bearing in mind the aforesaid principle, when we look to the intention of the legislature, we find that it is aimed to prevent innocent persons from harassment by unscrupulous persons from false complaints. Hence, in our opinion, the use of the expression "shall" and the background and the purpose for which the amendment has been brought, we have no doubt in our mind that inquiry or the investigation, as the case may be, is mandatory before summons are issued against the accused living beyond the territorial jurisdiction of the Magistrate."

34. *This Court has held that the Magistrate is duty bound to apply his mind to the allegations in the complaint together with the statements which are recorded in the enquiry while determining whether there is a prima facie sufficient ground for proceeding. In **Mehmood UI Rehman v. Khazir Mohammad Tunda**²¹, this Court followed the dictum in **Pepsi Foods Ltd. v. Special Judicial Magistrate**²², and observed that setting the criminal law in motion against a person is a serious matter. Hence, there must be an application of mind by the Magistrate to whether the allegations in the complaint together with the statements recorded or the enquiry conducted constitute a violation of law. The Court observed:*

"20. The extensive reference to the case law would clearly show that cognizance of an offence on complaint is taken for the purpose of issuing process to the accused. Since it is a process of taking judicial notice of certain facts which constitute an offence, there has to be application of mind as to whether the allegations in the complaint, when considered along with the statements recorded or the inquiry conducted thereon, would constitute violation of law so as to call a person to appear before the criminal court. It is not a mechanical process or matter of course. As held by this Court in

Pepsi Foods Ltd. v. Judicial Magistrate [Pepsi Foods Ltd. v. Judicial Magistrate, (1998) 5 SCC 749 : 1998 SCC (Cri) 1400] to set in motion the process of criminal law against a person is a serious matter.”

“22. The steps taken by the Magistrate under Section 190(1)(a) CrPC followed by Section 204 CrPC should reflect that the Magistrate has applied his mind to the facts and the statements and he is satisfied that there is ground for proceeding further in the matter by asking the person against whom the violation of law is alleged, to appear before the court. The satisfaction on the ground for proceeding would mean that the facts alleged in the complaint would constitute an offence, and when considered along with the statements recorded, would, *prima facie*, make the accused answerable before the court. No doubt, no formal order or a speaking order is required to be passed at that stage. The Code of Criminal Procedure requires speaking order to be passed under Section 203 CrPC when the complaint is dismissed and that too the reasons need to be stated only briefly. In other words, the Magistrate is not to act as a post office in taking cognizance of each and every complaint filed before him and issue process as a matter of course. There must be sufficient indication in the order passed by the Magistrate that he is satisfied that the allegations in the complaint constitute an offence and when considered along with the statements recorded and the result of inquiry or report of investigation under Section 202 CrPC, if any, the accused is answerable before the criminal court, there is ground for proceeding against the accused under Section 204 CrPC, by issuing process for appearance. The application of mind is best demonstrated by disclosure of mind on the satisfaction. If there is no such indication in a case where the Magistrate proceeds under Sections 190/204 CrPC, the High Court under Section 482 CrPC is bound to invoke its inherent power in order to prevent abuse of the power of the criminal court. To be called to appear before the criminal court as an accused is serious matter affecting one's dignity, self-respect and image in society. Hence, the process of criminal court shall not be made a weapon of harassment.”

These decisions were cited with approval in **Abhijit Pawar v. Hemant Madhukar Nimbalkar**²³. After referring to the purpose underlying the amendment of Section 202, the Court observed:

“25. ... the amended provision casts an obligation on the Magistrate to apply his mind carefully and satisfy

himself that the allegations in the complaint, when considered along with the statements recorded or the enquiry conducted thereon, would prima facie constitute the offence for which the complaint is filed. This requirement is emphasised by this Court in a recent judgment *Mehmood Ul Rehman v. Khazir Mohammad Tunda* [*Mehmood Ul Rehman v. Khazir Mohammad Tunda*, (2015) 12 SCC 420 : (2016) 1 SCC (Cri) 124]...”

35. While noting that the requirement of conducting an enquiry or directing an investigation before issuing process is not an empty formality, the Court relied on the decision in **Vijay Dhanuka** which had held that the exercise by the Magistrate for the purpose of deciding whether or not there is sufficient ground for proceeding against the accused is nothing but an enquiry envisaged under Section 202 of the Code.

36. In **Birla Corporation Ltd. v. Adventz Investments and Holdings**²⁴, the earlier decisions which have been referred to above were cited in the course of the judgment. The Court noted:

“26. The scope of enquiry under this section is extremely restricted only to finding out the truth or otherwise of the allegations made in the complaint in order to determine whether process should be issued or not under Section 204 CrPC or whether the complaint should be dismissed by resorting to Section 203 CrPC on the footing that there is no sufficient ground for proceeding on the basis of the statements of the complainant and of his witnesses, if any. At the stage of enquiry under Section 202 CrPC, the Magistrate is only concerned with the allegations made in the complaint or the evidence in support of the averments in the complaint to satisfy himself that there is sufficient ground for proceeding against the accused.”

Hence, the Court held:

“33. The order of the Magistrate summoning the accused must reflect that he has applied his mind to the facts of the case and the law applicable thereto. The application of mind has to be indicated by disclosure of mind on the satisfaction. Considering the duties on the part of the Magistrate for issuance of summons to the accused in a complaint case and that there must be sufficient indication as to the application of mind and observing that the Magistrate is not to act as a post office in taking cognizance of the complaint, in *Mehmood Ul Rehman* [*Mehmood Ul Rehman v. Khazir Mohammad Tunda*, (2015) 12 SCC 420 : (2016) 1 SCC (Cri) 124]...”

*The above principles have been reiterated in the judgment in **Krishna Lal Chawla v. State of U.P.**²⁵.”*

The Court considered the same later, in the light of a proceedings under Section 138/141C N.I. Act.

11. The Magistrate did not comply with the provision of Section 202 Cr.P.C., even though the petitioner reside **(in Uttar Pradesh)** outside the jurisdiction of the Trial Court, in a different State.
12. In the present case the Magistrate did not Conduct any inquiry into the case himself or direct an investigation as required under Section 202 Cr.P.C. before directing the issue of process and as such the order is not in accordance with law, and is thus an abuse of the process of law.
13. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Lalit Chaturvedi vs. State of U.P, Criminal Appeal No. of 2023 (Arising out of SLP (Crl.) No. 13485 of 2023)**:

“5. This Court, in a number of judgments, has pointed out the clear distinction between a civil wrong in the form of breach of contract, non-payment of money or disregard to and violation of the contractual terms; and a criminal offence under Sections 420 and 406 of the IPC. Repeated judgments of this Court, however, are somehow overlooked, and are not being applied and enforced. We will be referring to these judgments. The impugned judgment dismisses the application filed by the appellants under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. on the ground of delay/laches and also the factum that the chargesheet had been filed on 12.12.2019. This ground and reason is also not valid.

6. In “Mohammed Ibrahim v. State of Bihar”, this Court had referred to Section 420 of the IPC, to observe that in order to constitute an offence under the said section, the following ingredients are to be satisfied:—

“18. Let us now examine whether the ingredients of an offence of cheating are made out. The essential ingredients of the offence of “cheating” are as follows:

(i) deception of a person either by making a false or misleading representation or by dishonest concealment or by any other act or omission;

(ii) fraudulent or dishonest inducement of that person to either deliver any property or to consent to the retention thereof by any person or to intentionally induce that person so deceived to do or omit to do anything which he would not do or omit if he were not so deceived; and

(iii) such act or omission causing or is likely to cause damage or harm to that person in body, mind, reputation or property.

19. To constitute an offence under section 420, there should not only be cheating, but as a consequence of such cheating, the accused should have dishonestly induced the person deceived

(i) to deliver any property to any person, or

(ii) to make, alter or destroy wholly or in part a valuable security (or anything signed or sealed and which is capable of being converted into a valuable security).”

7. *Similar elucidation by this Court in “V.Y. Jose v. State of Gujarat”, explicitly states that a contractual dispute or breach of contract per se should not lead to initiation of a criminal proceeding. The ingredient of ‘cheating’, as defined under Section 415 of the IPC, is existence of a fraudulent or dishonest intention of making initial promise or representation thereof, from the very beginning of the formation of contract. Further, in the absence of the averments made in the complaint petition wherefrom the ingredients of the offence can be found out, the High Court should not hesitate to exercise its jurisdiction under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. saves the inherent power of the High Court, as it serves a salutary purpose viz. a person should not undergo harassment of litigation for a number of years, when no criminal offence is made out. It is one thing to say that a case has been made out for trial and criminal proceedings should not be quashed, but another thing to say that a person must undergo a*

criminal trial despite the fact that no offence has been made out in the complaint. This Court in V.Y. Jose (supra) placed reliance on several earlier decisions in “Hira Lal Hari Lal Bhagwati v. CBI”, “Indian Oil Corporation v. NEPC India Ltd.”, “Vir Prakash Sharma v. Anil Kumar Agarwal” and “All Cargo Movers (I) (P) Ltd. v. Dhanesh Badarmal Jain”.

10. *The charge sheet also refers to Section 406 of the IPC, but without pointing out how the ingredients of said section are satisfied. No details and particulars are mentioned. There are decisions which hold that the same act or transaction cannot result in an offence of cheating and criminal breach of trust simultaneously. For the offence of cheating, dishonest intention must exist at the inception of the transaction, whereas, in case of criminal breach of trust there must exist a relationship between the parties whereby one party entrusts another with the property as per law, albeit dishonest intention comes later. In this case entrustment is missing, in fact it is not even alleged. It is a case of sale of goods. The chargesheet does refer to Section 506 of the IPC relying upon the averments in the complaint. However, no details and particulars are given, when and on which date and place the threats were given. Without the said details and particulars, it is apparent to us, that these allegations of threats etc. have been made only with an intent to activate police machinery for recovery of money.*

11. *It is for the respondent no. 2/complainant – Sanjay Garg to file a civil suit. Initiation of the criminal process for oblique purposes, is bad in law and amounts to abuse of process of law.”*

14. It further appears from the materials on record that in the proceedings before the National Company Law Tribunal, Jaipur, the learned Tribunal held as follows :-

“The counsel for the applicant requests that this Tribunal may fix the interest on the claim amount of Rs. 11,33,919/-. Learned counsel for the respondent submits that the Hon’ble National Company Law Appellate Tribunal, New

Delhi in Company Appeal (AT) insolvency No. 144/2018 held as follows :-

“In the present appeals, as we find that the principle amount has already been paid and as per agreement no interest was payable, the applications under Section 9 on the basis of claims for entitlement of interest, were not maintainable. If for delayed payment Appellant(s) claim any interest, it will be open to them to move before a court of competent jurisdiction, but initiation of Corporate Insolvency Resolution Process is not the answer”.

In the present case, there is no claim for payment of interest which is fairly admitted by the learned counsel for the applicant. Hence, applying above judgment of the Hon’ble National Company Law Appellate Tribunal this Tribunal holds that since the main claim amount is paid off, the Company Petition is disposed of. However, it will be open to the Operational Creditor to move before a Court of competent jurisdiction for any claim of interest as per law.”

15. By an order dated 5.8.2019 in a proceedings being CP No.(IB)-153/9/JPR/**2019** the proceedings in the present case has been initiated prior to the said proceedings before the National Company Law Tribunal. As the proceeding in the present case is numbered CNS No. 195/**2018**, it is thus evident that **the complainant has settled the disputes with Accused No. 1 i.e. M/s. Chetak Enterprises Ltd. and accepted the total invoice amount of Rs. 11,33,919/- vide (i) Demand Draft No. 134418 for Rs. 56,771/- dated July 24, 2019, (ii) Demand Draft No. 1344156 for Rs. 10,52,072 dated July 24, 2019 and (iii) Demand Draft No. 973062 for Rs. 25,076/- dated August 03, 2019 (total amounting to Rs. 11,33,919/-) before the Hon’ble Court of NCLT Bench of Jaipur.**
16. Admittedly, the **parties** in this case **entered into business transaction** and as stated by the complainant, on the

representations and assurance given by the accused persons. From the petition of complaint before the trial Court it appears that sum of Rs. 14,04,100.06/- was due to the complainant from the accused persons.

17. From the order of the National Company Law Tribunal, Jaipur dated 5.8.2019 which was a subsequent proceeding, it appears that **the outstanding dues have been cleared.**
18. Copies of receipts of the year 2019 show that the accused persons herein paid a sum of rupees as noted in the order of the National Company Law Tribunal. The present proceeding has been initiated under Section 420/120B of the IPC, prior to receiving the amounts before the NCLT, thus the claim in the proceedings in this case has already been prima facie satisfied.
19. Report submitted by the State as to service upon the complainant shows that the premises is under lock and key and no occupant was found there.
20. **CRR 3337 of 2022 is allowed.**
21. The entire proceedings being CNS No. 195 of 2018 registered for offence punishable under Section 420/120B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, now pending before the Court of the Learned Metropolitan Magistrate, 19th Court at Calcutta, **is hereby quashed.**
22. All connected applications, if any, stands disposed of.
23. Interim order, if any, stands vacated.
24. Copy of this judgment be sent to the learned Trial Court for necessary compliance.

- 25.** Urgent certified website copy of this judgment, if applied for, be supplied expeditiously after complying with all, necessary legal formalities.

(Shampa Dutt (Paul), J.)