



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15747 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.15747 of 2024
and
Crl.M.P(MD)No.9912 and 9913 of 2024

1.Jeya Rani

2.Jesu Rajan

3.Josepin Shalini

: Petitioners /A1 to A3

Vs.

1.The State rep.by the Sub Inspector of Police,
Thisayanvilai Police Station,
Tirunelveli District.
Crime No.298 of 2020.

2.John Edison

... 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.334 of 2024 on the file of the learned District Munsif cum Judicial
Magistrate, Radhapuram, Tirunelveli District and quash the same.

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



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15747 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.334 of 2024 on the file of the learned District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Radhapuram, Tirunelveli District 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.298 of 2020 for the offences under Sections 324, 294(b), 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.334 of 2024 on the file of the learned District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Radhapuram, Tirunelveli District.

3. The case of the prosecution is that on 02.10.2020 all the accused have attacked the defacto complainant with iron rod and caused injuries to the defacto complainant and his wife.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15747 of 2024

WEB COPY

4. The main contention of the petitioner is that there existed civil dispute between the parties; that all the accused are family members and that a false complaint came to be lodged.

5.As rightly contended by the learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side), there are specific allegations against the petitioners. Just because there existed civil dispute between the parties before the occurrence, that by itself is not a ground to quash the charge sheet. Except the above aspects, 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 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



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15747 of 2024

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 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



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15747 of 2024

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 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.”



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15747 of 2024

WEB COPY

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 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.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15747 of 2024

WEB COPY

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 appearing for the petitioners would submit that the personal appearance of the petitioners before the trial Court may be dispensed with.

12. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, the personal appearance of the petitioners 1 and 2 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



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15747 of 2024

passing judgment and on the hearings, specifically directed by the trial court. The petitioners 1 and 2 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 1 and 2 shall not dispute the identity of the witnesses. The petitioners 1 and 2 shall appear before the Court in the event their presence is insisted by the trial judge for the purpose of identification. If the petitioners 1 and 2 adopt any dilatorial tactics, it is open to the Trial Court to insist for her appearance and deal with the petitioners 1 and 2 in accordance with the judgment of Supreme Court of India, ***in State of Uttar Pradesh Vs. Shambunath Singh***, reported in ***2001 (4) SCC 667***. Accordingly, Crl.M.P(MD)No.9913 of 2024 is ordered.

13. In the result, the Criminal Original Petition is dismissed. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition in Crl.M.P(MD)No.9912 is closed.

23.09.2024



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15747 of 2024

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

To

- 1.The District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate,
Radhapuram, Tirunelveli District.
- 2.The Sub Inspector of Police,
Thisayanvilai Police Station,
Tirunelveli District.
- 3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15747 of 2024

K.MURALI SHANKAR,J.

das

Order made in
Crl.O.P.(MD)No.15747 of 2024
and
Crl.M.P(MD)No.9912 and 9913 of 2024

Dated: 23.09.2024