



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15576 of 2024

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 19.09.2024

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE K.MURALI SHANKAR

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15576 of 2024

and

Crl.M.P(MD)No.9749 and 9750 of 2024

A.Pandirurai

: Petitioner/Sole Accused

Vs.

1.The State rep.by the Inspector of Police,
Sakkottai Police Station,
Sivagangai District.
Crime No.5 of 2024.

2.S.Rajeshwari

: Respondents

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS., to call for the records pertaining to the impugned charge sheet in C.C.No. 146 of 2024 pending on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Karaikudi for the alleged offences under Sections 294(b), 323, 506(ii) IPC and Section 4 of TNPHW Act 2002 and quash the same as illegal.

For Petitioner : Mr.T.Thiru Murugan

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



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15576 of 2024

ORDER

WEB COPY

The Criminal Original Petition has been filed, invoking Section 482 of Cr.P.C., seeking orders, to call for the records pertaining to the impugned charge sheet in C.C.No.146 of 2024 pending on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Karaikudi for the alleged offences under Sections 294(b), 323, 506(ii) IPC and Section 4 of TNPHW Act 2002 and quash the same as illegal.

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.5 of 2024 for the offences under Sections 294(b), 323, 506(ii) IPC and Section 4 of TNPHW Act, after completing the investigation, the first respondent has laid the final report and the same was taken on file in C.C.No.146 of 2024 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Karaikudi.

3. The case of the prosecution is that due to previous enmity, the petitioner has trespassed into the defacto complainant's house, attacked the defacto complainant and her husband and also caused criminal intimidation. Hence, the complaint.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15576 of 2024

WEB COPY

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that there existed civil dispute between the parties; that the petitioner's grandmother has lodged the complaint against the defacto complainant regarding the trespass and grazing of goats and due to that vengeance, the defacto complainant has lodged the false complaint against the petitioner and on that basis, the respondent police, without verification, has registered the case and without proper investigation has laid the charge sheet.

5. As rightly contended by the learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side), the above aspects/points canvassed by the petitioner, by no stretch of imagination, can be considered as reasons or grounds to quash the charge sheet. Though the petitioner has taken a stand that the petitioner is mentally retarded person, they have not produced any medical records to substantiate the same. Except the above, the learned counsel for the petitioner has not canvassed any other reason or ground to impugn the charge sheet.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15576 of 2024

WEB COPY

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.

(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



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15576 of 2024

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 on the basis of which no prudent person can ever reach a just conclusion that there is sufficient ground for proceeding against the accused;



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15576 of 2024

(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 and with caution and only when such exercise is justified by the tests specifically laid down in the Section itself.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15576 of 2024

WEB COPY

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 petitioner and it is a matter for trial.

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



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15576 of 2024

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

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

Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petitions are closed.

19.09.2024

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

To

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



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15576 of 2024

K.MURALI SHANKAR,J.

das

Order made in
Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15576 of 2024
and
Crl.M.P(MD)No.9749 and 9750 of 2024

Dated: 19.09.2024