



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15034 of 2024

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 10.09.2024

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE K.MURALI SHANKAR

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15034 of 2024

and

Crl.M.P.(MD)Nos.9416 and 9417 of 2024

1.Kravuthar Singh

2.Thamil Mani

... Petitioners

Vs.

1.State rep. by its
The Inspector of Police,
Suchindram Police Station,
Kanyakumari District.
(Crime No.156 of 2017)

2.Jayapaul

... Respondents

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 B.N.S.S., to call for the records in C.C.No.606 of 2022 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate III, Nagercoil and quash the same as against this petitioners as illegal.

For Petitioners : Mr.N.Mohideen Basha

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



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15034 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.606 of 2022 pending on the file of the Judicial Magistrate No.III, Nagercoil.

2. The case of the prosecution is that there existed previous enmity between the petitioners and the second respondent and that on 24.04.2017 at about 06.00 p.m., the first petitioner had abused the second respondent's wife in filthy language and at the instigation of the second petitioner, the first petitioner attacked the second respondent's wife with aruval and caused injuries.

3. It is evident from the records that on the basis of the complaint lodged by the second respondent, FIR came to be registered in Crime No. 156 of 2017 and after completing the investigation, the first respondent has filed the charge sheet against the petitioners for the alleged offences under Sections 294(b), 323, 324 and 506(2) IPC and the case was taken cognizance in C.C.No.606 of 2022 and the same is pending on the file of



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15034 of 2024

the Judicial Magistrate No.III, Nagercoil.

WEB COPY

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that there existed dispute between the petitioners and the second respondent, that they used to quarrel very often and on the occurrence day, there arose wordy quarrel between the parties and there is no specific injury sustained by the second respondent's wife and that there is no eye witness for the occurrence.

5. As rightly contended by the learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side), the above points, by no stretch of imagination, can be taken as grounds or reasons to impugn the charge sheet and are matter for trial. Except the above, the petitioners have 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



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15034 of 2024

extracted hereunder:-

WEB COPY

“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.

(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



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15034 of 2024

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 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



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15034 of 2024

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 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



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15034 of 2024

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. 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.

10. Considering the above facts and circumstances 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 petitioners, this Court concludes that the petition is devoid of merit and the same is liable to be dismissed.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15034 of 2024

WEB COPY

11. In the result, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition in Crl.M.P.(MD)No. 9416 of 2024 is closed.

12. Considering the age of the petitioners, 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 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 adopts 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



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15034 of 2024

of Supreme Court of India, *in State of Uttar Pradesh Vs. Shambunath*

WEB COPY

Singh, reported in *2001 (4) SCC 667*.

10.09.2024

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

To

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate No.III,
Nagercoil.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
Suchindram Police Station,
Kanyakumari District.
- 3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15034 of 2024

K.MURALI SHANKAR,J.

csn

Order made in
Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15034 of 2024
and
Crl.M.P.(MD)Nos.9416 and 9417 of 2024

Dated: 10.09.2024