



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16645 of 2024

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 14.10.2024

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE K.MURALI SHANKAR

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16645 of 2024

and

Crl.M.P.(MD)No.10447 of 2024

1.Marimuthu

2.Marisamy

3.Muthumani

4.Maragatham

5.Velammal

... Petitioners

Vs.

1.The State of Tamilnadu rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Jayamangalam Police Station,
Theni District.
(Crime No.151 of 2024)

2.Karthika

... Respondents

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS,
to call for the records pertaining to the First Information Report in Crime



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16645 of 2024

No.151 of 2024 on the file of the first respondent police and quash the same as illegal so far as the petitioners are concerned.

For Petitioners : Mr.K.Navaneetharaja

For R1 : Mr.P.Kottai Chamy
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

ORDER

The Criminal Original Petition has been filed, invoking Section 528 B.N.S.S., seeking orders to quash the FIR in Crime No.151 of 2024 pending on the file of the first respondent.

2. The petitioners are the accused 2 to 6 in Crime No.151 of 2024 on the file of Jayamangalam Police Station, Theni District.

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. 151 of 2024 on 09.08.2024 against six persons including the petitioners for the alleged offences under Sections 191(2) and 118(1) BNS.

4. The case of the prosecution is that there existed property dispute between the parties and that on 08.08.2024 at about 01.30 p.m., the



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16645 of 2024

accused persons had attacked the second respondent and caused injuries.

WEB COPY

5. It is not in dispute that on the basis of the complaint given by the third petitioner's mother Kalishwari, FIR came to be registered in Crime No.150 of 2024 against the second respondent and another for the alleged offences under Sections 296(b), 115(2), 131 and 351(2) BNS.

6. The main contention of the petitioners is that as per the report of the Surveyor, they have attempted to fence the property and even according to FIR, the first accused Kali alone had attacked the victim and there are no specific allegations against the petitioners.

7. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the first respondent would submit that in order to lay fence, the petitioners have assembled unlawfully and the first accused had attacked the second respondent. He would further submit that investigation is pending in both the matters.

8. It is not in dispute that the petitioners were very much available



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16645 of 2024

at the place of occurrence for the purpose of fencing the property. Hence, the contention raised by the petitioners cannot be gone into at this stage and it is matter for investigation. Except the above, the petitioners have not canvassed any other reason or ground to impugn the FIR.

9. 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



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16645 of 2024

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 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



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16645 of 2024

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.”

10. 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



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16645 of 2024

WEB COPY

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.

11. 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.

12. It is pertinent to note that if the petition under Section 528 B.N.S.S., was filed at the stage of FIR, the allegations in the FIR/



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16645 of 2024

complaint only are required to be considered and whether a cognizable offence is disclosed or not is required to be considered.

13. In the case on hand, as rightly contended by the learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side), a cursory perusal of the FIR makes out a *prima facie* case against the petitioners and contains specific allegations against the petitioners and it is a matter for investigation and as such, the question of quashing the FIR at this stage does not arise at all.

14. Since the present case in Crime No.151 of 2024 and the case in Crime No.150 of 2024 are case and case in counter, the first respondent is directed to follow the directions issued by the Hon'ble Full Bench of this Court in ***Crl.O.P.Nos.4587 of 2023 (Batch) dated 08.08.2024*** reported in ***2024 LiveLaw (Mad) 309*** and find out the aggressor and then file a final report before the jurisdictional Court within a period of four months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

15. With the above direction, this Criminal Original Petition stands



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16645 of 2024

dismissed. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

WEB COPY

14.10.2024

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No
csm

To

- 1.The Inspector of Police,
Jayamangalam Police Station,
Theni District.
- 2.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16645 of 2024

K.MURALI SHANKAR,J.

csn

Order made in
Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16645 of 2024
and
Crl.M.P.(MD)No.10447 of 2024

Dated: 14.10.2024