



Crl.O.P(MD).No.21678 of 2022

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 17.04.2024

CORAM :

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE A.A.NAKKIRAN

Crl.O.P(MD).No.21678 of 2022 and
Crl.M.P(MD).No.15273 of 2022

Krishnamurthy

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.II Class Executive Magistrate Cum Tahsildar,
Palani,
Dindigul District.

2.State rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Keeranur Police Station,
Dindigul District.
(Crime No.111 of 2022)

... Respondents

PRAYER:- Petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C., to call for the records of the 1st respondent and quash the further proceedings in M.C.No.112/2022/A1, dated 30.09.2022 pending on the file of the II Class Executive Magistrate Cum Tahsildar, Palani, Dindigul District.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Ramasamy

For respondent No.1 : Mr.K.Sanjai Gandhi

Government Advocate (Crl. Side)



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P(MD).No.21678 of 2022

ORDER

This petition is filed to quash the proceedings initiated by the first respondent in M.C.No.112/2022/A1, dated 30.09.2022 pending on the file of the II Class Executive Magistrate Cum Tahsildar, Palani, Dindigul District.

2.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the impugned notice dated 30.09.2022 under Section 111 Cr.P.C under challenge is void, and the proceedings against the petitioner is nullity and without any jurisdiction as substance of information received as required is incomplete and ambiguous. Notice without substance of information vitiate the proceedings. Failure to comply with the mandatory requirements of Section 111 Cr.P.C vitiates the preliminary order consequently, the proceeding. Hence, the learned counsel pleaded to quash the impugned summons.

3.The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondents contended that in the impugned notice, adequate information is given to the petitioner, it is enough to the person notified to defend



Crl.O.P(MD).No.21678 of 2022

himself against the allegations. When they had clear notice of the case against them, there may not be any prejudice. Hence, he pleaded to dismiss the original petition.

4.I have considered the matter in the light of the submissions made by the learned counsel for the parties.

5.The impugned notice is ordered by the II Class Executive Magistrate-cum-Tashildar on 30.09.2022 under Section 111 Cr.P.C. On perusal of the impugned notice issued under Section 110 (e) and 111 Cr.P.C, it is seen that the proceedings under Section 110(e) Cr.P.C., is instituted by a preliminary order under Section 111 Cr.P.C, which shall comply the following conditions:-

- (i) the order must be written
- (ii) substance of information against the person must be disclosed
- (iii) the amount of bond, period for the bond, number, character and class of sureties must be disclosed in the preliminary order under Section 111 Cr.P.C.

6.The issue of notice under Section 111 Cr.P.C is judicial act, the object behind this notice is being to enable the person to prepare for the



Crl.O.P(MD).No.21678 of 2022

defence. After the order is served, an enquiry is to be held under Section 116 Cr.P.C. After concluding enquiry, the II Class Executive Magistrate-cum-Tashildar then pass final order. Unless the II Class Executive Magistrate-cum-Tashildar place with the mandatory requirements of the provisions of law under Section 111 Cr.P.C, they will have no jurisdiction to direct the person to proceed against to appear before him or to secure their persons for the purpose of enquiry.

7.In the instant case, the impugned summon, dated 30.09.2022 mentioning only vague information about the complaint/information given by the Inspector of Police, substance of information received as required is incomplete. Thus, the notice without substance of information nullify the proceeding. The failure to comply with the mandatory requirements of setting forth, the substance of information under Section 111 Cr.P.C vitiate the notice/order and consequently, the proceeding would be quashed.

8.Further, a perusal of the impugned notice, it is seen that the II Class Executive Magistrate-cum-Tashildar called the petitioner to appear certain enquiry on 02.10.2022. Now, the said date is over. Hence, the



Crl.O.P(MD).No.21678 of 2022

impugned proceedings is liable to be quashed.

WEB COPY

9. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is allowed. The impugned order in M.C.No.112/2022/A1, dated 30.09.2022 pending on the file of the II Class Executive Magistrate Cum Tahsildar, Palani, Dindigul District is hereby quashed. Consequently connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

17.04.2024

Internet : Yes / No

Index : Yes / No

Speaking / Non Speaking order
trp

To

1. II Class Executive Magistrate Cum Tahsildar,
Palani,
Dindigul District.

2. The Inspector of Police,
Keeranur Police Station,
Dindigul District.

3. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P(MD).No.21678 of 2022

A.A.NAKKIRAN, J.

Trp

Crl.O.P(MD).No.21678 of 2022 and
Crl.M.P(MD).No.15273 of 2022

17.04.2024