



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.18391 of 2024

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 28.10.2024

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE K.MURALI SHANKAR

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.18391 of 2024

and

Crl.M.P.(MD)No.11414 of 2024

Murugesan

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The State of Tamil Nadu rep. by
The Sub Inspector of Police,
Chinnadharapuram Police Station,
Karur.
(Crime No.186 of 2022)

2.Easwaramurthi

... Respondents

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 B.N.S.S.,
to call for the records of C.C.No.55 of 2023 on the file of the District
Munsiff cum Magistrate Court Aravakuruchi, Karur District and quash
the same.

For Petitioner : Mr.Ramprakash Rajagopal

For R1 : Mr.K.Sanjai Gandhi
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.18391 of 2024

WEB COPY

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed, invoking Section 528 B.N.S.S., seeking orders to quash the charge sheet in C.C.No.55 of 2023 pending on the file of the District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Aravakurichi.

2. On the basis of the complaint given by the second respondent, FIR came to be registered in Crime No.186 of 2022 on 29.08.2022 for the alleged offences under Sections 294(b) and 323 IPC and after completing the investigation, charge sheet came to be filed for the offences under Sections 294(b), 323 and 324 IPC and the case was taken on file in C.C.No.55 of 2023 and is pending on the file of the District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Aravakurichi.

3. The case of the prosecution is that on 14.06.2022 at about 11.00 a.m., when the second respondent was in his home, the accused trespassed into the second respondent's house and abused him in filthy language and threatened him to withdraw the case pending against them and also attacked him and caused injury.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.18391 of 2024

WEB COPY

4. The main contention of the petitioner is that the matter is going to be settled and there are no specific allegations against the petitioner.

5. As rightly contended by the learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side), possibility for settlement is not a ground to quash the charge sheet and that there are specific allegations against the petitioner in the complaint as well as the in the statement recorded under Section 161(3) Cr.P.C. by the investigating officer. Except the above, the petitioner has not canvassed any other reason or ground to quash the charge sheet.

6. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***State of Haryana and others Vs. Bhajan Lal and others*** reported in ***1992 SCC (Cri) 426*** has enumerated 7 categories of cases, where the power can be exercised under Section 482 of Code of Criminal Procedure and the same are extracted hereunder:-

“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



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.18391 of 2024

extraordinary power under Article 226 or the inherent powers under Section 482 of the Code which we have extracted and reproduced above, we give the following categories of cases by way of 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 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



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.18391 of 2024

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



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.18391 of 2024

motive for wreaking vengeance on the accused and with a view to spite him due to private and personal grudge.”

7. In ***Dr.Dhruvaram Murlidhar Sonar Vs. The State of Maharashtra and others*** reported in ***2019 (18) SCC 191***, the Hon'ble Apex Court has specifically held that exercise of powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C. to quash the proceedings is an exception and not a rule. It is settled law that the inherent jurisdiction under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is wide but at the same time, the same is to be exercised sparingly, carefully and with caution and only when such exercise is justified by the tests specifically laid down in the Section itself.

8. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Kaptan Singh Vs. The State of Uttar Pradesh and others*** reported in ***2021 (3) Crimes 247*** has stated that, that Court in catena of decisions has observed that the High Court is not required to go into the merits of the allegations and/or enter into the merits of the case as if the High Court is exercising the appellate jurisdiction and/or conducting the trial and that question is required to be examined keeping in view, the contents of FIR and *prima facie* materials,



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.18391 of 2024

WEB COPY

if any, requiring no proof and at such stage, the High Court cannot appreciate evidence nor can it draw its own inferences from contents of FIR and materials relied on.

9. A cursory perusal of the final report and the statements filed along with the final report would make it clear that there existed a *prima facie* case to proceed against the petitioner.

10. Considering the above and also the submission made by the learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) and also taking note of the fact that this is not a fit case to quash the charge sheet against the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to grant the relief claimed.

11. In the result, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

28.10.2024

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No
csm



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.18391 of 2024

K.MURALI SHANKAR,J.

csn

To

- 1.The District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate,
Aravakurichi.
- 2.The Sub Inspector of Police,
Chinnadharapuram Police Station,
Karur.
- 3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

Order made in
Crl.O.P.(MD)No.18391 of 2024
and
Crl.M.P.(MD)No.11414 of 2024

Dated: 28.10.2024