



Crl.RC.No.1252 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 01.08.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE **M. DHANDAPANI**

Crl.RC.No.1252 of 2024
and
Crl.MP.No.10927 of 2024

Gokul @ Gokulnath

...Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Sub Divisional Executive Magistrate
and Revenue Divisional Officer,
Salem, Salem District.
2. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison – Salem,
Salem District.
3. The Inspector of Police,
Kannankuruchi Police Station,
Salem City, Salem District.

...Respondents

Criminal Revision Case filed under Section 397 & 401 of Cr.P.C.
to set aside the order of conviction of the petitioner passed by the 1st
respondent in MC.No.78 of 2024 dated 12.06.2024.

For Petitioner : Mr.J.Jayan

For Respondents : Mr.A.Gopinath
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)



Crl.RC.No.1252 of 2024

ORDER

WEB COPY

This Criminal Revision Case has been filed seeking quashment of the order of conviction passed by the 1st respondent in MC.No.78 of 2024 dated 12.06.2024.

2. The case of the petitioner is that, the petitioner executed a bond for good behaviour under Section 110 of Cr.P.C. before the 1st respondent and subsequently alleging that the petitioner violated the terms of the bond in another offence, the 3rd respondent filed a petition before the 1st respondent and sought for necessary action against the petitioner detaining him in prison. Pursuant to the same, the 1st respondent, vide impugned order dated 12.06.2024 ordered committal warrant. Challenging the same, the present revision has been filed.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the Executive Magistrate has no power to detain the petitioner for breach of bond under Section 120 of Cr.P.C. and the learned Judicial Magistrate alone can pass orders after conducting enquiry by invoking the power under Section 446 of Cr.P.C. for forfeiture of bond. He further submitted that the issue arise in



Crl.RC.No.1252 of 2024

this revision is no longer res integra and is covered by the decision of the Division Bench of this Court reported in **2023 1 L.W.(Crl.) 810 [P.Sathish @ Sathish Kumar Vs. State rep. by the Inspector of Police - Law and Order and another]**. Accordingly, he prayed for allowing this revision.

4. Learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) submitted that the petitioner is a habitual offender. Further, he did not dispute the facts submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner, however submitted that as against the order passed by the Division Bench of this Court, SLP is pending before the Apex Court.

5. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner as well as the learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondents.

6. It is useful to extract hereunder the relevant portions of the decision of the Division Bench of this Court reported in **2023 1 L.W.(Crl.) 810 [P.Sathish @ Sathish Kumar Vs. State rep. by the Inspector of Police - Law and Order and another]**:



WEB COPY



Crl.RC.No.1252 of 2024

“32.The question then is whether the Executive Magistrate can proceed to authorize detention under Section 122(1)(b) if it is proved that a bond executed under Section 107 to 110, pursuant to an order under Section 117, has been breached. Section 122(1)(b) reads as follows:

“(b) If any person after having executed a bond, [with or without sureties] without sureties for keeping the peace in pursuance of an order of a Magistrate under section 117, is proved, to the satisfaction of such Magistrate or his successor-in-office, to have committed breach of the bond, such Magistrate or successor-in-office may, after recording the grounds of such proof, order that the person be arrested and detained in prison until the expiry of the period of the bond and such order shall be without prejudice to any other punishment or forfeiture to which the said person may be liable in accordance with law.”

We have already concluded that the breach of a bond under Section 122(1)(b) would result in initiation of proceedings under Section 446 Cr.PC., for forfeiture and recovery of the sum covered by the bond. Thus, only a bond executed under Section 107 pursuant to an order under Section 117 comes within the net of this provision. Section 122(1)(b) does not use the expression Executive Magistrate, but merely states "Magistrate". Section 3(1) (a) of the Code reads as follows:

*“3. Construction of references.--(1) In this Code,--
(a) any reference, without any qualifying words, to a Magistrate, shall be construed, unless the context otherwise requires, --
(i) in relation to an area outside a metropolitan area, as a reference to a Judicial Magistrate;*



(ii) *in relation to a metropolitan area, as a reference to a Metropolitan Magistrate;.....”*

Therefore, where the Code merely uses the expression Magistrate it must be read, unless the context otherwise requires, as referring to a Judicial Magistrate or a Metropolitan Magistrate, as the case may be. The question is whether the meaning of the expression "Magistrate" in the context of Section 122(1)(b) warrants a departure from the aforesaid construction.

33.It is no doubt true that Section 122(1)(b) read literally requires proof of breach to be proved before "such Magistrate or his successor-in-office" before whom the bond was executed under Section 117. The larger question, however, is whether an Executive Magistrate is invested with powers under the Code to inflict punishment. Our attention was invited by the Amicus Curiae to Section 167(2-A) of the Code which authorizes the detention of an accused by an Executive Magistrate. It was pointed out that to exercise powers of detention Section 167 (2-A) requires that an Executive Magistrate must be specifically invested with the powers of a Judicial or Metropolitan Magistrate. This can be done by the High Court on a request made by the State Government under Sections 13 or 18 of the Code. This itself would show that the detention of a person, which is an interference with his personal liberty, cannot be done by an Executive Magistrate without being specially invested with the powers of a Judicial Magistrate.

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, 2016 SCC Online Mad 23460, 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 (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 (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



Crl.RC.No.1252 of 2024

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.”

7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and in view of the decision rendered by the Division Bench of this Court reported in **2023 1 L.W.(Crl.) 810 [P.Sathish @ Sathish Kumar Vs. State rep. by the Inspector of Police - Law and Order and another]**, particularly, paragraph no.88(c), the Executive Magistrate has no power to detain the petitioner for breach of bond and the learned Judicial Magistrate alone can pass orders after conducting enquiry by invoking the power under Section 446 of Cr.P.C. for forfeiture of bond. Hence, the impugned order is liable to be set aside and accordingly, the same is set aside.

8. Accordingly, this Criminal Revision Case is allowed. Consequently, in view of the above order passed by this court, no order needs to be passed in the connected Criminal Miscellaneous Petition in Crl.MP.No.10927 of 2024, accordingly, the same is closed.



Crl.RC.No.1252 of 2024

WEB COPY

9. It is reported that the revision petitioner is in jail in connection with this case. The revision petitioner, who is presently detained in the Central Prison, Salem is directed to be released forthwith unless his presence is required in connection with any other case.

01.08.2024

skt

Index : Yes / No

Speaking order : Yes / No

NCC : Yes / No

Note: Issue order copy on 02.08.2024.

To

1. The Sub Divisional Executive Magistrate
and Revenue Divisional Officer,
Salem, Salem District.
2. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison – Salem,
Salem District.
3. The Inspector of Police,
Kannankuruchi Police Station,
Salem City, Salem District.
4. The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court, Chennai.



Crl.RC.No.1252 of 2024

5. The Central Prison, Salem.

WEB COPY

M.DHANDAPANI, J.

skt

Crl.RC.No.1252 of 2024
and
Crl.MP.No.10927 of 2024



WEB COPY



Crl.RC.No.1252 of 2024

01.08.2024