



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No. 3379 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 24.03.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE **G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN**

Crl.O.P.No.3379 of 2025

R.Vivekananda

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.State rep. by Inspector of Police,
Oragadam Police Station, Kancheepuram.

2.Saranraj

..Respondents

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to quash the FIR in Crime No.312 of 2016 on the file of the first respondent.

For Petitioner : Mr.H.Mohamed Ghouse

For R1 : Mr.R.Vinothraja,
Government Advocate (crl.side)

For R2 : Mr.R.Venkatesulu



Crl.O.P.No. 3379 of 2025

WEB COPY


ORDER

This petition has been filed to quash the FIR in Crime No.312 of 2016 on the file of the first respondent, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 279 and 304(A) of IPC.

2. The case of the prosecution, as per FIR, is that on 10.10.2016, when the brother of the second respondent was riding his motorcycle bearing Registration No.TN 18 M 2498 from Athur, Chennai towards Oragadam, the petitioner, who was driving a car bearing registration No.TN 18 Y 9956 in a rash and negligent manner, hit the said motorcycle. As a result, the brother of the second respondent sustained a head injury and died on the spot. Hence, the complaint.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the FIR was registered in the year 2016 and till date, no charge sheet has been filed. Hence, he prays to quash the FIR.

4. The learned Government Advocate (crl.side) submitted that the entire investigation has been completed and the final report is ready to be



Crl.O.P.No. 3379 of 2025

WEB COPY

filed. It is also submitted that a Motor Accident Claim Petition is pending before the concerned Court.

5. Heard both sides and perused the materials placed on record.

6. On a perusal of the First Information Report, this Court finds that there are specific and serious allegations as against the petitioner which attract the ingredients of cognizable offences and warrant thorough investigation. It is well settled that an FIR is not expected to be an encyclopaedia of facts. The FIR in the present case discloses a *prima facie* commission of cognizable offences. Hence, this Court is not inclined to quash the FIR at this stage. The investigation machinery must be allowed to proceed in accordance with law to unearth the truth and bring the guilty to book.

7. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India passed in the judgment reported in **2019 (14) SCC 350** in the case of ***Sau. Kamal Shivaji Pokarnekar vs. The State of Maharashtra & ors., (Crl.A.No.255 of 2019*** dated **12.02.2019**) held that the learned Magistrate while taking



Crl.O.P.No. 3379 of 2025

WEB COPY

cognizance and summoning, is required to apply his judicial mind only with the view to taking cognizance of the offence whether a *prima facie* case has been made out for summoning the accused person. The learned Magistrate is not required to evaluate the merits of the materials or evidence in support of the complaint, because the Magistrate must not undertake the exercise to find out whether the materials would lead to conviction or not. Only in a case where the complaint does not disclose any offence or is frivolous, vexatious or oppressive, the complaint/FIR can be taken for consideration for quashment. If the allegations set out in the complaint do not constitute the offence of which cognizance has been taken by Magistrate, it can be considered for quashment. Therefore, it is not necessary that a meticulous analysis of the case should be done before the trial to find out whether the case would end in conviction or acquittal. If it appears on a reading of the complaint and consideration of the allegations therein, in the light of the statement made on oath that the ingredients of the offence are disclosed, there would be no justification to interfere. At the initial stage of issuance of process, it is no open to the Court to stifle the proceedings by entering into the merits of the contentions made on behalf of the accused. Therefore, the criminal



Crl.O.P.No. 3379 of 2025

WEB COPY

complaint cannot be quashed only on the ground that the allegations made therein appear to be of a civil nature. If the ingredients of the offence alleged against the accused are *prima facie* made out in the complaint, the criminal proceeding shall not be interdicted.

8. Further the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India issued directions in the judgment reported in **2021 SCC Online SC 315** in the case of ***M/s.Neeharika Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd., Vs. State of Maharashtra & ors.***, as follows :-

“23.

vi) *Criminal proceedings ought not to be scuttled at the initial stage;*

vii) *Quashing of a complaint/FIR should be an exception rather than an ordinary rule;*

.....

xii) *The first information report is not an encyclopedia which must disclose all facts and details relating to the offence reported. Therefore, when the investigation by the police is in progress, the court should not go into the merits of the allegations in the FIR. Police must be permitted to complete the investigation. It would be premature to pronounce the conclusion based on hazy*



WEB COPY




Crl.O.P.No. 3379 of 2025

facts that the complaint/FIR does not deserve to be investigated or that it amounts to abuse of process of law. After investigation, if the investigating officer finds that there is no substance in the application made by the complainant, the investigating officer may file an appropriate report/summary before the learned Magistrate which may be considered by the learned Magistrate in accordance with the known procedure;

.....

xv) When a prayer for quashing the FIR is made by the alleged accused and the court when it exercises the power under Section 482 Cr.P.C., only has to consider whether the allegations in the FIR disclose commission of a cognizable offence or not. The court is not required to consider on merits whether or not the merits of the allegations make out a cognizable offence and the court has to permit the investigating agency/police to investigate the allegations in the FIR;”

9. In view of the above discussions, this Court is not inclined to quash the First Information Report in Crime No.312 of 2016. However, the first respondent is directed to complete the investigation in Crime No.312 of 2016 and file the final report within a period of four weeks



Crl.O.P.No. 3379 of 2025

WEB COPY

from the date of receipt of copy of this Order, before the jurisdiction
Magistrate, if not already filed.

10. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed.

24.03.2025

Neutral citation : Yes/No
Speaking/non-speaking order
shk

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN, J.

shk

To

1.The Inspector of Police,
Oragadam Police Station, Kancheepuram.

2. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

Page 7 of 8



WEB COPY



CrI.O.P.No. 3379 of 2025

CrI.O.P.No.3379 of 2025

24.03.2025