



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16573 of 2024

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.16573 of 2024

and

Crl.M.P.(MD)Nos.10401 and 10402 of 2024

K.Mathankumar

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
Thiruvaiyaru Police Station,
Thanjavur District.
(Crime No.410 of 2017)

2.Indirani

... Respondents

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 B.N.S.S., to call for the records pertaining to the charge sheet in C.C.No.79 of 2024 on the file of learned Judicial Magistrate Court, Thiruvaiyaru, Thanjavur District and quash the same as illegal in so far as the petitioner concerned.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Edin Brough

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



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16573 of 2024

WEB COPY

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed, invoking Section 528 B.N.S.S., seeking orders to quash the charge sheet in C.C.No.79 of 2024 pending on the file of the Judicial Magistrate, Thiruvaiyaru, Thanjavur District.

2. On the basis of the complaint given by the second respondent, FIR came to be registered in Crime No.410 of 2017 on 15.11.2017 for the alleged offences under Sections 147, 294(b) and 506(2) IPC and after completing the investigation, charge sheet came to be filed for the alleged offences under Sections 294(b) and 506(2) IPC and the case was taken on file in C.C.No.79 of 2024 and is pending on the file of the Judicial Magistrate, Thiruvaiyaru.

3. The case of the prosecution is that due to property dispute, on 09.11.2017 at about 09.30 a.m., the petitioner along with other accused went to the second respondent's house and had abused the second respondent in filthy language and threatened her with dire consequences.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16573 of 2024

WEB COPY

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that counter FIR came to be registered in Crime No.409 of 2017 and after completing the investigation, charge sheet came to be filed and the case was taken on file in C.C.No.78 of 2024 and is pending before the Judicial Magistrate, Thiruvaiyaru.

5. The main contention of the petitioner is that in the charge sheet, they have shown the front portion of the second respondent's house as the occurrence place but in the rough sketch and in the observation mahazar, they have shown the front portion of one Sankar's house as the occurrence place. Even assuming that the prosecution has given wrong occurrence place, that by itself is not a ground to quash the charge sheet at this point of time and it is matter for trial.

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:-



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16573 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.16573 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.16573 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.”

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



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16573 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.

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.

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 petitioner, this Court is not inclined to grant the relief claimed.

11. In the result, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition in Crl.M.P.(MD)No. 10401 of 2024 is closed.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16573 of 2024

WEB COPY

12. Considering the fact that the petitioner is having 80% of blindness, the personal appearance of the petitioner before the trial Court is ordered to be dispensed with, on conditions that he 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 all the hearings, specifically directed by the trial court. The petitioner is further directed to give an undertaking in the form of affidavit that he will be duly represented by a counsel on all hearing dates and that the counsel representing him will cross examine the prosecution witnesses on the same day they are examined in chief. The petitioner shall not dispute the identity of the witnesses. The petitioner shall appear before the Court in the event his presence is insisted by the trial judge for the purpose of identification. If the petitioner adopts any dilatorial tactics, it is open to the Trial Court to insist for his appearance and deal with the petitioner in accordance with the judgment of Supreme Court of India, *in State of Uttar Pradesh Vs. Shambunath Singh*, reported in *2001 (4) SCC 667*.

14.10.2024

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



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16573 of 2024

WEB COPY To

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



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16573 of 2024

K.MURALI SHANKAR,J.

csn

Order made in
Crl.O.P.(MD)No.16573 of 2024
and
Crl.M.P.(MD)Nos.10401 and 10402 of 2024

Dated: 14.10.2024