



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15819 of 2024

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 23.09.2024

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE K.MURALI SHANKAR

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15819 of 2024

and

Crl.M.P.(MD)Nos.9981 & 9982 of 2024

Mohammed Fahad @ Mohamed Fahad

... Petitioner/Accused No.1

Vs.

1.The Inspector of Police,
Kottar Police Station,
Kanyakumari District.
(In Crime No.8 of 2023)

2.Mohamed Thahir

... Respondents

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS, to call for the records pertaining to the case registered in charge sheet in STC.No.667 of 2023 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Nagercoil, Kanyakumari District and quash the same as illegal as far as the petitioner is concerned.

For Petitioner : Mr.G.Anto Prince

For R1 : Mr.E.Antony Sahaya Prabahar,
Additional Public Prosecutor.



WEB COPY



Cr.L.O.P.(MD)No.15819 of 2024

ORDER

This criminal original petition has been filed seeking orders to quash the charge sheet in STC.No.667 of 2023 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Nagercoil, Kanyakumari District.

2.It is seen from the records that on the basis of the complaint lodged by the second respondent, FIR came to be registered in Cr.No.8 of 2023 and after completion of investigation, charge sheet came to be filed and case was taken on file in STC.No.667 of 2023 for the offence under Sections 294(b), 323, 355 and 506(1) IPC and the same is pending on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Nagercoil, Kanyakumari District.

3.The case of prosecution is that the the defacto complainant and his wife got separated long back and when they met in a marriage hall, the accused had attacked the defacto complainant and caused injuries.



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.15819 of 2024

WEB COPY

4.The main contention of the petitioner is that the prosecution has given three versions of the occurrence that the defacto complainant himself called 108 Ambulance and came to be admitted in the hospital and that in the statement recorded under Section 161(3) Cr.P.C., he had stated that the persons who were available in the occurrence place had taken him to the hospital.

5.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the defacto complainant's complaint and the 161 Cr.PC. Statement are contradictory to each other in material particulars of the case. As rightly pointed out by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the first respondent, the above grounds raised/canvassed by the petitioner, by no stretch of imagination, can be considered as reasons/grounds to quash the proceedings and the same are matter for trial.

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



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.15819 of 2024

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.

(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



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.15819 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



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.15819 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 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



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.15819 of 2024

WEB COPY

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 petitioner. Therefore, this Court concludes that the petition is devoid of merit and the same is liable to be dismissed.

10.In the result, this criminal original petition is dismissed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

23.09.2024

Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No
gns



WEB COPY



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.15819 of 2024

K.MURALI SHANKAR,J.

gns

To

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

CrI.O.P.(MD)No.15819 of 2024

23.09.2024