



*Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16577 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.16577 of 2024

and

Crl.M.P.(MD)No.10403 of 2024

Anand

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.State of Tamilnadu rep by  
The Inspector of Police,  
Traffic Investigation Wing-III,  
Madurai City,  
C-1, Thideer Nagar Police Station,  
Madurai District.  
(Crime No.105 of 2024)

2.Balan

... Respondents

**PRAYER :** Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS,  
to call for the records relating to the FIR in Crime No.105 of 2024 on the  
file of first respondent police and quash the same.

For Petitioner : M/s.S.Meena

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



*Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16577 of 2024*

WEB COPY

### **ORDER**

The Criminal Original Petition has been filed, invoking Section 528 B.N.S.S., seeking orders to quash the FIR in Crime No.105 of 2024 pending on the file of the first respondent.

2. The petitioner is the sole accused in Crime No.105 of 2024 on the file of Traffic Investigation Wing-III, Madurai City.

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. 105 of 2024 on 02.07.2024 against the petitioner for the alleged offences under Sections 279 and 337 IPC.

4. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner had parked his car bearing Registration No.TN-67-BL-0092 and opened the door in a negligent manner, due to which, the second respondent, who had driven a two wheeler bearing Registration No.TN-59-AF-3273, hit the car and fell down and got injuries.

5. The main contention of the petitioner is that though the accident



*Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16577 of 2024*

was occurred on 20.06.2024, FIR came to be registered on 02.07.2024 and that the mode of accident projected by the prosecution is false and incorrect.

6. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the first respondent would submit that in the accident, the second respondent has lost his leg and that investigation is pending.

7. Even assuming that there existed delay in filing the complaint, that by itself is not a ground to quash the FIR. Moreover, regarding the mode of accident, the same has to be investigated and that cannot be gone into, in the present quash proceedings. Except the above, the petitioner has not canvassed any other reason or ground to impugn the FIR.

8. 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:-



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16577 of 2024

WEB COPY

*“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 the F.I.R. do not disclose a cognizable offence, justifying an investigation by police officers under Section 156(1) of the*



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16577 of 2024

*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 redress for the grievance of*



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16577 of 2024

*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.”*

9. 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.

10. 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



*Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16577 of 2024*

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.

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

12. Considering the above, this Court concludes that the petition is devoid of merit and the same is liable to be dismissed. Hence, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

**14.10.2024**

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



WEB COPY



*Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16577 of 2024*

**K.MURALI SHANKAR,J.**

csn

To

- 1.The Inspector of Police,  
Traffic Investigation Wing-III,  
Madurai City,  
C-1, Thideer Nagar Police Station,  
Madurai District.
- 2.The Additional Public Prosecutor,  
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,  
Madurai.

Order made in  
Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16577 of 2024  
and  
Crl.M.P.(MD)No.10403 of 2024

Dated: 14.10.2024