



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.14610 of 2024

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 04.09.2024

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE K.MURALI SHANKAR

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.14610 of 2024
and
Crl.M.P.(MD)No.9107 of 2024

V.Manikandan

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The State of Tamilnadu represented by
The Sub Inspector of Police,
Vallathirakottai Police Station,
Pudukottai District.
(Crime No.33 of 2022)

2.Balu

... Respondents

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS,
to call for records relating to FIR in Crime No.33 of 2022 pending on the
file of the first respondent police and quash the same as against the
petitioner is concern.

For Petitioner : Mr.N.Kamesh

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



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.14610 of 2024

WEB COPY

ORDER

The Criminal Original Petition has been filed, invoking Section 528 B.N.S.S., seeking orders to quash the FIR in Crime No.33 of 2022 dated 21.03.2022 pending on the file of the first respondent.

2. The petitioner is the third accused in Crime No.33 of 2022 on the file of Vallathirakottai Police Station, Pudukkottai.

3. On the basis of the complaint lodged by the second respondent, FIR came to be registered in Crime No.33 of 2022 against four named persons including the petitioner and 4 unknown persons for the alleged offences under Sections 147, 294(b), 323 and 506(1) IPC.

4. The case of the prosecution is that on 20.03.2022 at about 10.30 p.m., four persons had abused the second respondent and attacked him and caused criminal intimidation.

5. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the first respondent would submit that the complaint discloses cognizable offence and as such, the same has to be investigated and



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.14610 of 2024

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.

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 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.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.14610 of 2024

(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



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.14610 of 2024

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.”

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



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.14610 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.

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, 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. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that there is no piece of evidence or material to prove the alleged offence against the petitioner, that the police did not conduct proper enquiry regarding the complaint and registered the case and that the petitioner is



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.14610 of 2024

in no way connected with the case.

WEB COPY

10. But as rightly contended by the learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side), the above aspects cannot be gone into in the present stage and are matter for investigation.

11. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the first respondent would submit that they have already examined five witnesses and investigation is pending. He would further submit that there are specific allegations against the petitioner and other accused.

12. 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.

13. Except the above, the petitioner has not canvassed any other reason or ground to impugn the FIR. Hence, this Court concludes that the petition is devoid of merit and the same is liable to be dismissed.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.14610 of 2024

WEB COPY

14. Since FIR is pending from 2022 onwards, the first respondent is directed to complete the investigation in Crime No.33 of 2022 and file final report within a period of four months before the jurisdictional Court from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

15. With the above direction, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

04.09.2024

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

To

- 1.The Sub Inspector of Police,
Vallathirakottai Police Station,
Pudukottai District.
- 2.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.14610 of 2024



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.14610 of 2024

K.MURALI SHANKAR,J.

csn

Order made in
Crl.O.P.(MD)No.14610 of 2024
and
Crl.M.P.(MD)No.9107 of 2024

Dated: 04.09.2024