



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 19.03.2024

WEB COPY

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE N.ANAND VENKATESH

CRL.O.P No.6056 of 2024
and CRL.M.P No.4415 of 2024

P.Pandian

...Petitioner

Vs.

Chemplast Sanmar Limited
Mettur Dam,
Rep. By its Vice President (Personal)
R.Doraisamy
No.9, Cathedral Road,
Mettur Dam -2
Salem District

...Respondents

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Criminal Procedure Code, to call for the records relating to the case in CC No.45 of 2014 on the file of Judicial Magistrate II, Mettur.

For Petitioner : Mr.B.Kumarasamy

For Respondent : Mr.S.Manuraj



WEB COPY

ORDER

This petition has been filed seeking to quash the proceedings in CC No.45 of 2014 on the file of Judicial Magistrate II, Mettur.

2.This Court had already dealt with the issue in a batch of petitions in Crl OP Nos.1180, 1183 and 1184 of 2024 and disposed of the petitions by an order dated 29.01.2024. The relevant portions are extracted hereunder :-

4.The petitioners had earlier approached this Court and filed quash petitions challenging the very initiation of the proceedings by the respondent Company. These quash petitions were dealt with and a common order was passed on 15.11.2023, dismissing the quash petitions and directing the Court below to complete the proceedings, within a period of two months.

5.Pursuant to the above order, the petitioner filed memo before the Court below on the ground that as on the day when the complaint was filed, Section 630 of the Companies Act was no more in force and the case is governed under Section 452 of the Companies Act, 2013. Hence, according to the petitioners, the Court below ought not to have taken cognizance of the complaint and in view of the fact that the complaint itself is unsustainable, the petitioners wanted to be discharged from the case.



WEB CO

6.The Court below through the impugned order dated 21.12.2023, dismissed all the memos as not maintainable. Aggrieved by the same, these criminal original petitions have been filed before this Court.

7.In the considered view of this Court, the petitioners had already approached this Court by raising certain grounds seeking to quash the proceedings initiated by the respondent Company. While filing those quash petitions, the petitioners never raised a ground that the complaint itself is not maintainable under Section 630 of the Companies Act. In fact, such a ground was available to the petitioners even when they had filed their earlier quash petitions. The petitioners having failed to raise this ground, have gone before the Court below and have filed memo to the effect that Section 452 of the Companies Act, 2013 had come into force and therefore, the complaint filed under Section 630 of the Companies Act is not maintainable.

8.In the considered view of this Court, the Court below is governed by the procedure provided under the Code of Criminal Procedure. Therefore, if any application is filed before the Court below, it has to be traced to some provision under the Code of Criminal Procedure. Admittedly, the trial has commenced and the proceedings are going on before the Court below and at that stage, the petitioners cannot seek for discharge from the case by filing a memo. At the best, the ground that has been raised in the memo can be taken as a ground by the petitioners to defend themselves in the case. The same will be considered by the Court below on its own merits and in



accordance with law.

WEB COPY

9. In the light of the above discussion, this Court does not find any illegality or infirmity in the order passed by the Court below in not entertaining the memo filed by the petitioners. The Court below has rightly taken into consideration the fact that the earlier quash petitions were dismissed by this Court and a direction was also given to complete the proceedings, within a time frame. The same shall be kept in mind by the Court below and in addition to the same, whatever grounds are raised by the petitioners shall also be considered independently on its own merits and in accordance with law and dismissal of the quash petitions will not come in the way of the petitioners to raise the legal grounds before the Court below.

3. This Criminal Original petition is also disposed of in terms of the above order. Considering the fact that the proceedings are initiated in the year 2014, the Court below is directed to complete the proceedings within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

19.03.2024

Index: Yes/No
Internet: Yes/No
rka



To

1. Judicial Magistrate II, Mettur.

2. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



N.ANAND VENKATESH, J

rka

CRL.O.P No.6056 of 2024
and CRL.M.P No.4415 of 2024

19.03.2024