



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15746 of 2024

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 23.09.2024

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE K.MURALI SHANKAR

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15746 of 2024

and

Crl.M.P(MD)No.9909 and 9910 of 2024

1.Ramalingam

2.Rajjam

: Petitioners /A1 & A2

Vs.

1.The State rep.by the Inspector of Police,
Tamil University Police Station,
Thanjavur, Thanjavur District.

2.Suganthi

... Respondents

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS.,
to call for the records pertaining to the impugned proceedings in
C.C.No.12 of 2024 on the file of the Additional Mahila Court (Magistrate
Level) Thanjavur and quash the same.

For Petitioners : Mr.A.Joel Paul Antony

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



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15746 of 2024

WEB COPY

ORDER

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 proceedings in C.C.No.12 of 2024 on the file of the Additional Mahila Court (Magistrate Level) Thanjavur and quash the same.

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 05.12.2022 at about 08.50 am, the accused due to previous enmity had attacked the defacto complainant and her husband and abused them in filthy language and harassed the complainant sexually and caused criminal intimidation.

3. 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.837 of 2022 for the offences under Sections 294(b), 323, 354A, 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.12 of 2024 on the file of the learned Additional Mahila Court (Magistrate Level) Thanjavur.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15746 of 2024

WEB COPY

4. The main contention of the petitioners is that both of them are working as Assistant Professors in Mannar Saraboji Arts and Science College, Thanjavur; that both of them were not at all available at the occurrence place and they were working in the college at that time; that the occurrence alleged by the complainant is false and incorrect and that the police, without proper investigation, has laid the final report.

5. As rightly contended by the learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side), the plea of alibi cannot be gone into in the present proceedings and is matter for trial. As rightly contended by the learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side), there are specific allegations against the petitioners and more importantly, levelled allegations that they have sexually harassed the defacto complainant and caused injuries to her and her husband. Except the above aspects, the learned counsel for the petitioners has not canvassed any other reason or ground to impugn 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



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15746 of 2024

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 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



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15746 of 2024

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;

(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



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15746 of 2024

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 merits of the case as if the High Court is exercising the appellate jurisdiction



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15746 of 2024

WEB COPY

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

11. At this juncture, the learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that since the petitioners are working in college, their appearance may be dispensed with.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15746 of 2024

WEB COPY

12. 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 their 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 her 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.15746 of 2024

WEB COPY

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

Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

23.09.2024

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

To

- 1.The Additional Mahila Court (Magistrate Level)
Thanjavur.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
Tamil University Police Station,
Thanjavur, Thanjavur District.
- 3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15746 of 2024

K.MURALI SHANKAR,J.

das

Order made in
Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15746 of 2024
and
Crl.M.P(MD)No.9909 and 9910 of 2024

Dated: 23.09.2024