



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.13627 of 2024

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 20.08.2024

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE K.MURALI SHANKAR

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.13627 of 2024
and
Crl.M.P.(MD)No.8476 of 2024

K.Vignesh

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Tallakulam Police Station,
Tallakulam, Madurai City.
(Crime No.1156 of 2019)

2.Rajkumar Julien

... Respondents

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS,
to call for the records in Crime No.1156 of 2019 dated 26.07.2019 on the
file of the first respondent police and quash the same.

For Petitioner : Mr.V.Nagendran

For R1 : Mr.P.Kottai Chamy
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

ORDER

The Criminal Original Petition has been filed, invoking Section



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.13627 of 2024

528 B.N.S.S., seeking orders to quash the FIR in Crime No.1156 of 2019 on the file of the first respondent.

2. The petitioner is the third accused in Crime No.1156 of 2019 on the file of Thallakulam Police Station, Madurai City.

3. On the basis of the complaint lodged by the second respondent, FIR came to be registered in Crime No.1156 of 2019 against three persons including the petitioner herein for the alleged offences under Sections 448, 294(b), 323 and 506(2) IPC.

4. The case of the prosecution is that on 26.07.2019, the petitioner and other accused persons trespassed into the college premises of the second respondent and when the same was questioned by him, the accused persons had attacked him and abused him in filthy language.

5. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that though FIR came to be registered on 26.07.2019, final report has not been filed so far.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.13627 of 2024

WEB COPY

6. At this juncture, the learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the first respondent would submit that investigation has already been completed and charge sheet was made ready during the corona period but they have not filed the same before the jurisdictional Court and he has also produced the copy of the final report.

7. The main contention of the petitioner is that the prosecution has not produced any medical records to substantiate the offence under Section 323 IPC. But it is settled law that any specific injury is not necessary and even experiencing pain is enough to attract Section 323 IPC.

8. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner has completed L.L.B. before the Karnataka State Law University, but it is seen from the complaint that the petitioner, by alleging that he is an advocate, has trespassed into the office of the second respondent and committed the alleged offences.

9. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the first respondent would submit that in the FIR, it has been



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.13627 of 2024

specifically stated that the petitioner had abused the second respondent in filthy language and attacked him. He would further submit that the complaint discloses cognizable offence and as such, the same has to be investigated and considering the nature of the allegations and the existence of *prima facie* case, this is not a fit case for quashing the FIR at this stage.

10. 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



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.13627 of 2024

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 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



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.13627 of 2024

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.”

11. In *Dr.Dhruvaram Murlidhar Sonar Vs. The State of*



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.13627 of 2024

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.

12. 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.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.13627 of 2024

WEB COPY

13. It is pertinent to note that if the petition under Section 528 B.N.S.S., was filed at the stage of FIR, the allegations in the FIR/ complaint only are required to be considered and whether a cognizable offence is disclosed or not is required to be considered.

14. In the case on hand, as rightly contended by the learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side), a cursory perusal of the FIR makes out a *prima facie* case against the accused and as such, the question of quashing the FIR at this stage does not arise at all. Hence, this Court concludes that this is not a fit case to invoke Section 482 Cr.P.C., for quashing the FIR at this stage and the same is liable to be dismissed.

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

20.08.2024

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



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.13627 of 2024

WEB COPY

To

- 1.The Inspector of Police,
Tallakulam Police Station,
Tallakulam, Madurai City.
- 2.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.13627 of 2024

K.MURALI SHANKAR,J.

csn

Order made in
Crl.O.P.(MD)No.13627 of 2024
and
Crl.M.P.(MD)No.8476 of 2024

Dated: 20.08.2024