



CRL OP(MD). No.785 of 2022

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

Date : 08.02.2024

CORAM

The Hon`ble Mr.Justice M. DHANDAPANI

CRL OP(MD) No.785 of 2022
and Crl.M.P.(MD) Nos.568 and 569 of 2022

1. Lakshmi
2. Subbulakshmi
3. Murugan
4. Solaiammal
5. Valli
6. Mani
7. Ovulu Lakshmi @ Lakshmi
8. Murugesan
9. Muthumari @ Muthumariammal
10. Azhagar @ Alagar
11. Jeyakrishnan

... Petitioners

Vs

1. State Represented by
The Inspector of Police,
Kamuthi Police Station,
Ramanathapuram District.



CRL OP(MD). No.785 of 2022

2. Velammal, F/A 47 years
W/o. Arivalagan,
Nedungulam Road,
Ramasampatti,
Kamuthi Taluk,
Ramanathapuram District.

... Respondents

PRAYER :- Criminal Original Petition file under section 482 of Cr.P.C., to call for the records relating to the proceedings in P.R.C. No.15 of 2021 on the file of the Learned District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Kamuthi, Ramanathapuram District and quash the same as illegal.

For Petitioners : M/s. T. Veerakumar

For Respondents : M/s. SS. Madhavan for R1
Additional Public Prosecutor
No appearance for R2

ORDER

This petition has been filed to quash P.R.C.No.15 of 2021 on the file of the learned District Munsif Cum Judicial Magistrate, Kamuthi, Ramanathapuram District.

2. The case of the prosecution is that one Ponmani, ie., daughter of the de-facto complainant married the brother of the petitioners 1 and 2. It is alleged that Ponmani and one Ashokkumar had illicit relationship, due to which, both of them have committed had decided to do away with the



CRL OP(MD). No.785 of 2022

brother of the petitioners 1 and 2. Because of the said motive, the petitioners have attacked the de-facto complainant in his house and hence, a complaint came to be registered and upon completion of investigation, chargesheet has been filed before the jurisdictional court, quashing which, the petitioners are before this court with this petition.

3.The learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners have nothing to do with the alleged offences and prays for interference. He would further submit that since there are arguable points in favour of the petitioners, seeks an opportunity to canvass all the points before the trial court.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) would submit that there are materials available to proceed with the case as against the petitioners herein and at the threshold, the criminal proceedings cannot be quashed and the charges against the petitioners 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



CRL OP(MD). No.785 of 2022

case on file and this Court is of the considered view that no prejudice would be caused to the petitioners, if they are subjected to due trial as sufficient opportunity would be given to them to put forth their defence. The petitioners cannot be let by quashing the charges framed against them as that would completely undermine the alleged act, which is the subject matter of criminal trial pending against them. 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



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No.785 of 2022

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 P.R.C. No.15 of 2021, pending on the file of the learned District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Kamuthi, Ramanathapuram District, Accordingly, this petition, being devoid of merits, is dismissed.



CRL OP(MD). No.785 of 2022

Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are dismissed.

WEB COPY

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 petitioners, the appearance of the petitioners before the trial court is dispensed with except for their 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 petitioners is necessary, the trial court, at its wisdom, shall direct their appearance on those days.

08.02.2024

RR

TO

- 1.The District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Kamuthi.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
Kamuthi Police Station, Ramanathapuram District.



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No.785 of 2022

M.DHANDAPANI. J

RR

**ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.785 of 2022**

Date : 08.02.2024