



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.13711 of 2024

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 21.08.2024

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE K.MURALI SHANKAR

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.13711 of 2024
and
Crl.M.P.(MD)No.8498 of 2024

Muthukumar

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.State Rep by
The Inspector of Police,
Crime Crime Branch,
Tirunelveli City.
(Crime No.4 of 2024)

2.Valarmathi
Joint Sub-Registrar-I,
Original Document Section,
Palayamkottai, Tirunelveli.

... Respondents

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS, to call for the records pertaining to the FIR in Crime No.4 of 2024 registered by the first respondent police and quash the same against the petitioner.

For Petitioner : Mr.D.Venkatachalam

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



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.13711 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.4 of 2024 dated 30.04.2024 on the file of the first respondent.

2. The petitioner is the second accused in Crime No.4 of 2024 on the file of CCB, Tirunelveli City.

3. The case of the prosecution is that on 11.01.2024, the petitioner/ second accused has presented the document executed by the first accused for selling the land for registration, that the second respondent has kept the document pending for verification of the genuineness of the patta granted by the Tahsildar and after getting confirmation of the genuinity of the patta, the second respondent registered the document vide Doc No. 496 of 2024 and that subsequently after coming to know about the impersonation and execution of sale deed, the second respondent lodged a complaint and on that basis, FIR came to be registered in Crime No.4 of 2024 against two persons including the petitioner herein for the alleged offences under Sections 419, 465, 467, 468 and 471 IPC.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.13711 of 2024

WEB COPY

5. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner was searching for the property and after coming to know that the first accused was owning a property, he purchased the same.

6. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the first respondent would submit that the property in dispute originally belonged to one Viswanathan and he died, that the first accused by impersonating the said Viswanathan has executed the sale deed in favour of the petitioner, that the petitioner along with first accused had created necessary documents for presenting the same before the Sub Registrar and that thereafter the petitioner has sold the property to third party.

7. The pleas now raised by the petitioner are matter for investigation and the same cannot be gone into, in the present proceedings.

8. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.13711 of 2024

for the first respondent would 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.

9. 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



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.13711 of 2024

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 non-cognizable offence, no investigation is permitted by a police officer without an order of a Magistrate as contemplated under Section 155(2) of



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.13711 of 2024

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.”

10. 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



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.13711 of 2024

WEB COPY

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.

11. 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.

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/



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.13711 of 2024

complaint only are required to be considered and whether a cognizable offence is disclosed or not is required to be considered.

13. 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 528 B.N.S.S., for quashing the FIR at this stage and the same is liable to be dismissed.

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

21.08.2024

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



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.13711 of 2024

WEB COPY To

- 1.The Inspector of Police,
Crime Crime Branch,
Tirunelveli City.
- 2.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.13711 of 2024

K.MURALI SHANKAR,J.

csn

Order made in
Crl.O.P.(MD)No.13711 of 2024
and
Crl.M.P.(MD)No.8498 of 2024

Dated: 21.08.2024