



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.14230 of 2024

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 29.08.2024

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE K.MURALI SHANKAR

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.14230 of 2024

and

Crl.M.P.(MD)Nos.8825 and 8826 of 2024

1.Pandimani

2.Pandiarajan

3.Maruthupandi

4.Velmurugan

... Petitioners

Vs.

1.The State rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Ponnamaravathi Police Station,
Pudukkottai District.
(Crime No.119 of 2022)

2.Balamurugan

... Respondents

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 B.N.S.S., to call for the records relating to the proceedings in S.C.No.26 of 2024 on the file of learned Additional District and Sessions Judge, Pudukkottai and quash the same as against the petitioners.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.14230 of 2024

WEB COPY

For Petitioners : Mr.S.Mahendra Pathy

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

ORDER

The Criminal Original Petition has been filed, invoking Section 528 B.N.S.S., seeking orders to quash the charge sheet in S.C.No.26 of 2024 pending on the file of the Additional District and Sessions Court, Pudukkottai.

2. The case of the prosecution is that due to previous enmity, on 20.05.2022, the petitioners/accused 1 to 4 had attacked the second respondent/defacto complainant by using knife and abused him in filthy language.

3. On the basis of the complaint lodged by the second respondent, FIR came to be registered in Crime No.119 of 2022 on 21.05.2022 for the alleged offences under Sections 294(b), 323 and 307 IPC against the petitioners and after completing the investigation, the first respondent has filed the charge sheet against the petitioners for the alleged offences



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.14230 of 2024

under Sections 294(b), 323 and 307 IPC and the case was taken cognizance in S.C.No.26 of 2024 and is pending on the file of the Additional District and Sessions Court, Pudukkottai.

4. 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



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.14230 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;



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.14230 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.”

5. 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



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.14230 of 2024

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.

6. 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.

7. The main contention of the petitioner is that the injured has suffered only simple injury and as such, the question of invoking Section 307 IPC does not arise, that though the FIR discloses participation of ten



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.14230 of 2024

persons, FIR was registered only against four persons and that the independent witness has not stated about the participation of the petitioners in the crime. However, all the above aspects, by no stretch of imagination, cannot be taken as grounds to quash the charge sheet. The pleas now raised by the petitioners are matter for trial and the same cannot be gone into in the present quash proceedings.

8. Except the above, the petitioners have not canvassed any other reason or ground to impugn the charge sheet.

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 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 is not inclined to grant the relief claimed.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.14230 of 2024

11. In the result, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed.

Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petitions are closed.

29.08.2024

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

To

1.The Additional District and Sessions Judge,
Pudukkottai.

2.The Inspector of Police,
Ponnamaravathi Police Station,
Pudukkottai District.

3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.14230 of 2024



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.14230 of 2024

K.MURALI SHANKAR,J.

csn

Order made in
Crl.O.P.(MD)No.14230 of 2024
and
Crl.M.P.(MD)Nos.8825 and 8826 of 2024

Dated: 29.08.2024