



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.17016 of 2024

WEB COPY BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 16.10.2024

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE K.MURALI SHANKAR

CrI.O.P.(MD)No.17016 of 2024
and
CrI.M.P.(MD)No.10693 of 2024

Ragavan

... Petitioner/A2

Vs.

1.The State of Tamil Nadu rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
District Crime Branch,
Tenkasi District.
(Crime No.7 of 2023)

2..Ananth

... Respondents

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS, to call for the records of the case in Crime No.7 of 2023 on the file of the first respondent Police and quash the same in so far as the petitioner/A2 is concerned.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Sankar,

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



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.17016 of 2024

WEB COPY

ORDER

The Criminal Original Petition has been filed, invoking Section 528 B.N.S.S., seeking orders, to call for the records of the case in Crime No.7 of 2023 on the file of the first respondent Police and quash the same in so far as the petitioner/A2 is concerned.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner by giving promise that he would arrange the job in the Co-operative Department and received a sum of Rs.6 lakhs from the defacto complainant and thereby cheated the defacto complainant.

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.7 of 2023 on 27.03.2023 against the two persons including the petitioner for the alleged offences under Sections 420, 294(b) and 506(1) IPC.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that it is only a loan transaction and the petitioner has already issued a cheque and



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.17016 of 2024

WEB COPY

instead of filing complaint under Section 138 of NI Act, they have set up the case of job rocketing and filed the present complaint.

5. As already pointed out by the learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side), the complaint was given as if the petitioner cheated the defacto complainant by receiving a sum of Rs.6 lakhs under the guise of getting a job in the Co-operative Department. He would further submit that they have already examined eight witnesses and investigation is pending. Except the above, petitioner 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



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.17016 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.17016 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.”



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.17016 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.17016 of 2024

WEB COPY

9. 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.

10. 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 petitioner and contains specific allegations against the petitioner and it is a matter for investigation and as such, the question of quashing the FIR at this stage does not arise at all.

11. In the result, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed. The first respondent is directed to file the final report before the jurisdictional Court within a period of four months from the date of receipt of copy of this order. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

16.10.2024

das



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.17016 of 2024

K.MURALI SHANKAR,J.

das

To

- 1.The Inspector of Police,
District Crime Branch,
Tenkasi District.
- 2.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.17016 of 2024
and
Crl.M.P.(MD)No.10693 of 2024

Dated: 16.10.2024