



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15199 of 2024

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 11.09.2024

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE K.MURALI SHANKAR

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15199 of 2024

and

Crl.M.P(MD)Nos.9509 and 9510 of 2024

1.Krishnamoorthy

2.Selvasaravanan

3.Velsamy : Petitioners/A1 to A3

Vs.

1.The State rep.by the Inspector of Police,
Valliyoor Police Station,
Tirunelveli District.
Crime No.365 of 2022.

2.Baskar ... Respondents

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS., to call for the records proceeding charge sheet in C.C.No.116 of 2023 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Valliyoor in connection with Crime No.365 of 2022 on the file of the first respondent police and quash the same.

For Petitioners : Mr.K.K.Samy



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15199 of 2024

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

ORDER

The Criminal Original Petition has been filed, invoking Section 528 of BNSS., seeking orders, to call for the records proceeding charge sheet in C.C.No.116 of 2023 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Valliyoor in connection with Crime No.365 of 2022 on the file of the first respondent police and quash the same.

2. It is evident from the records that on the basis of the complaint given by the second respondent, FIR came to be registered in Crime No.365 of 2022 for the offences under Sections 447, 294(b), 427, 379 and 506(ii) IPC and after completing the investigation, the first respondent has laid the final report and the same was taken on file in C.C.No.116 of 2023 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate Court, Valliyoor.

3. The case of the prosecution is that the first petitioner and the second respondent are brothers; that there existed land dispute between



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15199 of 2024

the parties; that on 07.12.2022, the accused trespassed into the land in dispute and removed the fuse carrier in the Electricity Box and also damaged the CCTV and on 29.12.2022, the accused caused criminal intimidation and on that basis, the present FIR came to be registered.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that though the occurrence was on 07.12.2022, the complaint came to be lodged on 30.12.2022 after the lapse of 23 days; that there was a property dispute between the first petitioner and the defacto complainant and that therefore, the defacto complainant tried to give criminal color to the civil dispute.

5. Even assuming that there was a delay in lodging the complaint, that by itself is not a ground to quash the charge sheet at this point of time. As rightly contended by the learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the State, that the above aspects, by no stretch of imagination can be taken as reasons or grounds to quash the charge sheet as the same cannot be gone into at this stage and are matter for trial. He would further submit that there are sufficient materials to



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15199 of 2024

proceed against the petitioners and hence, the first respondent has rightly laid the charge sheet against the accused.

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.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15199 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.15199 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 wide but at the same time, the same is to be exercised sparingly, carefully



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15199 of 2024

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. 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 and it is a matter for trial.

10. Except the above aspects, the learned counsel for the petitioners has not canvassed any other reason or ground to impugn the



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15199 of 2024

charge sheet. Hence, this Court concludes that the Criminal Original Petition is devoid of merits and the same is liable to be dismissed.

11. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, 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 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 his presence is insisted by the trial judge for the purpose of identification. If the petitioners adopt 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 of Supreme Court of India, *in State of Uttar Pradesh Vs. Shambunath Singh*, reported in *2001 (4) SCC 667*.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15199 of 2024

WEB COPY

12. In the result, the Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

11.09.2024

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No
das

To

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate,
Valliyoor.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
Valliyoor Police Station,
Tirunelveli District.
- 3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15199 of 2024

K.MURALI SHANKAR,J.

das

Order made in
Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15199 of 2024
and
Crl.M.P(MD)Nos.9509 and 9510 of 2024

Dated: 11.09.2024