



Crl.O.P.No.6302 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 06.03.2025

CORAM:

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

Crl.O.P.No.6302 of 2025

B.Manivel

... Petitioner

Vs

1. State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Pennagaram Police Station,
Dharmapuri District.
(Crime No.294 of 2024)

2. Velan

... Respondents

Prayer:Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 of B.N.S.S., to call for the records and quash the First Information Report in Crime No.294 of 2024 pending investigation on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner : Mr.D.Bharathy

For Respondents : Mr.K.M.D.Muhilan,
Government Advocate (Crl. Side) (for R1)



Crl.O.P.No.6302 of 2025

ORDER

WEB COPY

This petition has been filed to quash the First Information Report in Crime No.294 of 2024 pending investigation on the file of the respondent police.

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 29.11.2024, the petitioner scolded the second respondent and also attacked him with a wooden log. Therefore, the second respondent was admitted to the hospital and underwent treatment. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that a counter complaint was lodged and the same has been registered as an FIR in Crime No.293 of 2024 for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 296(b), 118(1), and 351(2) of BNS. Further, the second respondent is working in TASMACH and has influence with the first respondent and thus, the First Information Report was registered. He would further submit that the petitioner is an innocent person and has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. Without any basis, the first respondent Police



Crl.O.P.No.6302 of 2025

registered a case in Crime No.294 of 2024 for the offences under Sections 296(b), 118(1), and 351(2) of BNS, as against the petitioner. Hence, he prayed to quash the same.

4. The learned Government Pleader (Crl.Side) appearing for the first respondent would submit that the investigation is almost completed and the first respondent Police have only to file final report.

5. Heard the learned Counsel for the petitioner and learned Government Pleader (Crl.Side) appearing for the first respondent and perused the materials placed on record.

6. It is seen from the First Information Report that there are specific allegations as against the petitioner to attract the offence, which has to be investigated in depth. Further the FIR is not an encyclopedia and it need not contain all facts and it cannot be quashed in the threshold. This Court finds that the FIR discloses *prima facie* commission of cognizable offence and as such this Court cannot interfere with the investigation. The investigating machinery has to step in to investigate, grab and unearth the crime in




Crl.O.P.No.6302 of 2025

accordance with the procedures prescribed in the Code.

WEB COPY

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 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



Crl.O.P.No.6302 of 2025

WEB COPY

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 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;*

.....



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.6302 of 2025

xii) *The first information report is not an encyclopaedia 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 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;”*



Crl.O.P.No.6302 of 2025

WEB COPY 9. In view of the above discussions, this Court is not inclined to quash the First Information Report. However, the first respondent is directed to complete the investigation in both the First Information Reports in Crime Nos.293 and 294 of 2024 by following the procedure laid down under the Police Standing Order 566 and to file final reports within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this Order, before the jurisdictional Magistrate, if not already filed.

10. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed.

06.03.2025

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

kv

To

1. The Inspector of Police,
Pennagaram Police Station,
Dharmapuri District.
2. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

Page 7 of 8



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.6302 of 2025

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN. J.

kv

Crl.O.P.No.6302 of 2025

06.03.2025