



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.18244 of 2024

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 24.10.2024

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE K.MURALI SHANKAR

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.18244 of 2024

and

Crl.M.P.(MD)No.11320 of 2024

Tamilarasan

... Petitioner

Vs.

**1.The State of Tamil Nadu rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Adiramapattinam Police Station,
Thanjavur District.
(Crime No.304 of 2024)**

2.Mahesh Kumar

... Respondents

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS, to call for the records pertaining to the impugned First Information Report in Crime No.304 of 2024 on the file of the first respondent police and quash the same as illegal and unconstitutional in so far as this petitioner/first accused is concerned.

For Petitioner : Mr.B.Jameel Arasu

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



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.18244 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.304 of 2024 pending on the file of the first respondent.

2. The petitioner is the first accused in Crime No.304 of 2024 on the file of Adiramapattinam Police Station, Thanjavur.

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. 304 of 2024 on 23.09.2024 against two persons including the petitioner herein for the alleged offences under Sections 61(2), 329, 232(1) and 351(2) BNS.

4. The case of the prosecution is that FIR came to be registered against the petitioner and is pending before the Special Court for POCSO Act Cases and that the petitioner on 13.09.2024 went to the Brilliant CBSE School, where the victim girl was studying, to threaten the victim girl not to depose against him and that the Headmaster of the said School



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.18244 of 2024

WEB COPY

has sent a letter to the second respondent informing the above occurrence and on that basis, the present FIR came to be registered.

5. The main contention of the petitioner is that in the complaint, it has been stated that the Headmaster of the said School has sent a letter dated 02.09.2024 alleging that the petitioner had visited the School on 13.09.2024.

6. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the first respondent would submit that it was only a typing mistake and that the letter was sent on 20.09.2024. He would further submit that they have already collected the CCTV footage to show that the petitioner had visited the concerned School on that day.

7. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that there are no materials or evidence so as to attract the offence under Section 232(1) BNS. It is settled law that FIR cannot be considered as an encyclopedia so as to contain all the particulars or ingredients of the offence alleged and it is matter for investigation. Except the above, the



petitioner has not canvassed any other reason or ground to quash 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:-

“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



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.18244 of 2024

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 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



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.18244 of 2024

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.”

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



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.18244 of 2024

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 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.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.18244 of 2024

WEB COPY

12. 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. Hence, this Court concludes that this is not a fit case to invoke Section 528 B.N.S.S., for quashing the FIR at this stage and the same is liable to be dismissed.

13. In the result, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

24.10.2024

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

To

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



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.18244 of 2024



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.18244 of 2024

K.MURALI SHANKAR,J.

csn

Order made in
Crl.O.P.(MD)No.18244 of 2024
and
Crl.M.P.(MD)No.11320 of 2024

Dated: 24.10.2024