



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.144 of 2022

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 23.01.2024

CORAM:

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

Crl.O.P.(MD) No.144 of 2022 and
Crl.M.P.(MD).Nos.98 and 99 of 2022

P.Arumugam

... Petitioner/Accused No.2

Vs.

1.State rep.
the Inspector of Police,
K.Pudur Police Station
Madurai City
(Crime No.221 of 2020)

2.Padmanaban
Manager
Quality Control Section
Aruna Alloy company (P) Ltd.,
Super B3 B6 SIDCO Industries
K.Pudur, Madurai

...Respondents

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C, to call for the records in C.C.No.876 of 2021, on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate, No.VI, Madurai and quash the same.

For petitioner
For R-1

: Mr.AK.Azhagarsamy
: Mr.S.S.Madhavan,
Government Advocate
(Criminal Side)

For R-2

: No Appearance



WEB COPY



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.144 of 2022

ORDER

This petition has been filed seeking to quash the charge sheet in C.C.No.876 of 2021 for the offence punishable under Sections 408 and 109 IPC on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate, No,VI Madurai.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner is arrayed as A-2 and A-1, who was the employee of the 2nd respondent company said to have stolen official documents. It is alleged that at the instigation of this petitioner/A2, who was the Deputy General Manager of the 2nd respondent company, A1 said to have committed the offence and hence, on the complaint preferred by the 2nd respondent, a case has been registered in Crime No.221/2020 and upon completion of investigation, charge sheet has been laid before the court below for offences under Sections 408 and 109 IPC.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that though a complaint has been preferred as if at the instigation of the petitioner, A1 had stolen the official documents. He would further submit that A1 has simply taken his own documents and it is neither the case of the 2nd respondent nor the case of the respondent police that the documents were



recovered from either A1 or A2. It is his further submission that section 408 IPC does not attract, however, Intellectual Property Act alone would attract. On these grounds, he prays for allowing this petition.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) would submit that there are materials available to proceed with the case as against the petitioner herein and at the threshold, the criminal proceedings cannot be quashed and the charges against the petitioner have to be gone into only at the time of trial and hence, he prayed for dismissal of the petition.

5. In the above circumstances, the trial court has rightly taken the case on file and this Court is of the considered view that no prejudice would be caused to the petitioner, if he is subjected to due trial as sufficient opportunity would be given to him to put forth his defence. The petitioner cannot be let by quashing the charges framed against him as that would completely undermine the alleged act, which is the subject matter of criminal trial pending against him. Useful reference in this regard can be had to the decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***State of Haryana – Vs - Bhajan Lal (1992 SCC (Crl.) 426)*** wherein, the Hon'ble Apex Court held as under :



“102. In the backdrop of the interpretation of the various relevant provisions of the Code under Chapter XIV and of the principles of law enunciated by this Court in a series of decisions relating to the exercise of the extra-ordinary power under Article 226 or the inherent powers under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, which we have extracted illustration wherein such power could be exercised either to prevent abuse of the process of any Court or otherwise to secure the ends of justice, though it may not be possible to lay down any precise, clearly defined and sufficiently channelised and inflexible guidelines or rigid formulae and to give an to give an exhaustive list of myriad kinds of cases wherein such power should be exercised:

(1) where the allegations made in the First Information Report or the complaint, even if they are taken at their face value and accepted in their entirety do not prima facie constitute any offence or make out a case against the accused;

(2) where the allegations in the First Information Report and other materials, if any, accompanying the F.I.R. do not disclose a cognizable offence, justifying an investigation by police officers under Section 156(1) of the Code except under an order of a Magistrate within the purview of Section 155(2) of the Code;

(3) where the uncontroverted allegations made in the FIR or 'complaint and the evidence collected in support of the same do not disclose the commission of any offence and make out a case against the accused;



(4) where, the allegations in the FIR do not constitute a cognizable offence but constitute only a non-cognizable offence, no investigation is permitted by a police officer without an order of a Magistrate as contemplated under Section 155(2) of the Code;

(5) where the allegations made in the FIR or complaint are so absurd and inherently improbable on the basis of which no prudent person can ever reach a just conclusion that there is sufficient ground for proceeding against the accused;

(6) where there is an express legal bar engrafted in any of the provisions of the Code or the concerned Act (under which a criminal proceeding is instituted) to the institution and continuance of the proceedings and/or where there is a specific provision in the Code or the concerned Act, providing efficacious redress for the grievance of the aggrieved party;

(7) where a criminal proceeding is manifestly attended with mala fide and/or where the proceeding is maliciously instituted with an ulterior motive for wreaking vengeance on the accused and with a view to spite him due to private and personal grudge.”

6. For the reasons aforesaid, this Court finds no ground or scope to quash C.C.No.876 of 2021, pending on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate, No.VI, Madurai. Accordingly, this petition, being devoid of merits, is dismissed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are dismissed.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.144 of 2022

7. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that this Court may consider dispensing with the personal appearance of the petitioners before the court below. Taking into consideration the request as made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the appearance of the petitioner before the trial court is dispensed with except for his appearance for the purpose of receiving the copy of the proceedings u/s 207 Cr.P.C., framing of charges, questioning under Section 313 Cr.P.C. and on the day on which judgment is to be pronounced. However, if for any particular reason, the presence of the petitioner is necessary, the trial court, at its wisdom, shall direct his appearance on those days.

23.01.2024

Index : Yes/No

Internet : Yes/No

RR

To

1. The Judicial Magistrate, No.VI, Madurai.

2.The Inspector of Police,
K.Pudur Police Station
Madurai District.

3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.144 of 2022

M.DHANDAPANI. J.

RR

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.144 of 2022

23.01.2024