



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.12786 of 2024

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 02.09.2024

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE K.MURALI SHANKAR

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.12786 of 2024
and
Crl.M.P.(MD)No.7896 of 2024

1.P.Venkatesan

2.P.Subramani

... Petitioners

Vs.

1.The Inspector of Police,
B-5 Southgate Police Station (L&O),
Madurai Town, Madurai.

2.S.Maheswari

... Respondents

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C., to quash the charge sheet pending against the petitioners/accused Nos.3 & 4 in Calendar Case No.96 of 2016 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.IV, Madurai insofar as the petitioners are concerned.

For Petitioners : Mr.R.Sevugaraja

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



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.12786 of 2024

ORDER

WEB COPY

This criminal original petition has been filed seeking orders to quash the charge sheet pending against the petitioners/accused Nos.3 & 4 in Calendar Case No.96 of 2016 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.IV, Madurai.

2.The case of the prosecution is that on 17.12.2014 at about 17 hours, the accused persons compelled the defacto complainant to do one day prostitution to get huge money for her and for the livelihood of the accused and hence, the defacto complainant lodged a complaint.

3.It is seen from the records that on the basis of the complaint given by the second respondent, FIR came to be registered in Cr.No.635 of 2014 for the offence under Sections 4(2)(c), 5(1)(a), 5(1)(d) of the Immoral Traffic (Prevention) Act, 1956 and after completion of investigation, the final report came to be filed and case was taken on file in C.C.No.96 of 2016 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.IV, Madurai.



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.12786 of 2024

WEB COPY

4.The main contention of the petitioner is that even at the time of remand, the defacto complainant has appeared before the learned Magistrate and disowned her allegations and on that basis, the petitioners were released on bail on own bond.

5.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 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



WEB COPY



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.12786 of 2024

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;



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.12786 of 2024

(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.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



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.12786 of 2024

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.

7.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, 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.

8.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 petitioners.



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.12786 of 2024

WEB COPY

9.The grounds raised/canvassed by the petitioner, by no stretch of imagination, can be considered as reasons/grounds to quash the proceedings and the same are matter for trial. Except the above, the petitioners have not shown any other valid reason or ground to quash the complaint. Therefore, this Court concludes that the petition is devoid of merit and the same is liable to be dismissed.

10.At this juncture, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would request that the personal appearance of the petitioners before the trial Court may be dispensed with.

11.Considering the above, the personal appearance of the petitioners before the trial Court is ordered to be dispensed with, on conditions that they shall appear at the time of initial questioning, proceedings under Section 313 of Cr.P.C., and at the time of passing judgment and on all the hearings, specifically directed by the trial court. The petitioners are further directed to give an undertaking in the form of affidavit that they will be duly represented by a counsel on all hearing dates and that the counsel representing them will cross examine the



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.12786 of 2024

prosecution witnesses on the same day they are examined in chief. The petitioners shall not dispute the identity of the witnesses. The petitioners shall appear before the Court in the event their presence is insisted by the trial judge for the purpose of identification. If the petitioners adopt any dilatorial tactics, it is open to the Trial Court to insist for their appearance and deal with the petitioners in accordance with the judgment of Supreme Court of India, *in State of Uttar Pradesh Vs. Shambunath Singh*, reported in *2001 (4) SCC 667*.

12.Since the case is pending from the year 2016, the learned Judicial Magistrate No.IV, Madurai is directed to complete the trial and dispose of the case in C.C.No.96 of 2016, within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

13.With the above direction, this criminal original petition is dismissed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

02.09.2024

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No
gns



WEB COPY



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.12786 of 2024

To

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate No.IV, Madurai
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
B-5 Southgate Police Station (L&O),
Madurai Town, Madurai.
- 3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.12786 of 2024

K.MURALI SHANKAR,J.

gns

CrI.O.P.(MD)No.12786 of 2024

02.09.2024