



Crl.O.P.No.3911 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 13.02.2025

CORAM:

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

Crl.O.P.No.3911 of 2025
and Crl.M.P.No.2523 of 2025

Ajith @ Ajithkumar

... Petitioner

Vs

1. The State represented by
Inspector of Police,
Thirupathur Taluk Police Station,
Tirupathur District.

2. Malliga

... Respondents

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 528 of Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to call for the records pertaining to
CC.No.280/2023 on the file of learned Judicial Magistrate No.2, Thirupattur
and quash the same.

For Petitioner : Mr.B.Sundarapandiyan

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

ORDER

This petition has been filed to quash the proceeding in
CC.No.280/2023 on the file of learned Judicial Magistrate No.2, Thirupattur.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned



Crl.O.P.No.3911 of 2025

Government Advocate (Crl.side) for the first respondent and perused the materials placed on record.

3. The case of the prosecution is that the second respondent lodged a complaint before the first respondent alleging that the accused demolished the house of the defacto complainant, stolen the jewels and cash. They also destroyed 200 plantain trees and other trees. Further, the accused also damaged the educational certificates of defacto complainant's children and also threatened her with dire consequences. Hence, a case was registered in Crime No.291 of 2022 for the offences punishable under Sections 147, 148, 427, 435, 380 and 506(i) of IPC. After completion of investigation, final report has been filed and the same has been taken cognizance in C.C.No.280 of 2023 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate No.II, Thirupathur.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is arrayed as A8 and there is no specific overtact as against the petitioner to attract the offences as alleged by the prosecution. That apart, now the petitioner has been selected for a Government post by the Tamil Nadu Public Service Commission.



WEB COPY

5. A perusal of the statement recorded under Section 161(3) of Cr.P.C revealed that there are specific allegations as against the petitioner and also all are serious in nature. There are ingredients to attract the offences under Sections 147, 148, 427, 435, 380 and 506(i) of IPC.

6. In this regard, it is relevant to rely upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India passed in ***CrI.A.No.579 of 2019*** dated ***02.04.2019*** in the case of ***Devendra Prasad Singh Vs. State of Bihar & Anr.,*** as follows:-

" 12. So far as the second ground is concerned, we are of the view that the High Court while hearing the application under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. had no jurisdiction to appreciate the statement of the witnesses and record a finding that there were inconsistencies in their statements and, therefore, there was no prima facie case made out against respondent No.2. In our view, this could be done only in the trial while deciding the issues on the merits or/and by the Appellate Court while deciding the appeal arising out of the final order passed by the Trial Court but not in Section 482 Cr.P.C. proceedings.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.3911 of 2025

13. In view of the foregoing discussion, we allow the appeal, set aside the impugned order and restore the aforementioned complaint case to its original file for being proceeded with on merits in accordance with law.

7. Recently, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India dealing in respect of the very same issue in ***Crl.A.No.1572 of 2019*** dated 17.10.2019 in the case of ***Central Bureau of Investigation Vs. Arvind Khanna***, wherein, it has been held as follows:

“19. After perusing the impugned order and on hearing the submissions made by the learned senior counsels on both sides, we are of the view that the impugned order passed by the High Court is not sustainable. In a petition filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C., the High Court has recorded findings on several disputed facts and allowed the petition. Defence of the accused is to be tested after appreciating the evidence during trial. The very fact that the High Court, in this case, went into the most minute details, on the allegations made by the appellant-C.B.I., and the defence put-forth by the respondent, led us to a conclusion that the High Court has exceeded its power, while exercising its inherent jurisdiction under Section 482 Cr.P.C.



WEB COPY



CrI.O.P.No.3911 of 2025

20. In our view, the assessment made by the High Court at this stage, when the matter has been taken cognizance by the Competent Court, is completely incorrect and uncalled for.”

8. Further the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India also held in the order dated **02.12.2019** in **CrI.A.No.1817 of 2019** in the case of **M.Jayanthi Vs. K.R.Meenakshi & anr**, as follows:

"9. It is too late in the day to seek reference to any authority for the proposition that while invoking the power under Section 482 Cr.P.C for quashing a complaint or a charge, the Court should not embark upon an enquiry into the validity of the evidence available. All that the Court should see is as to whether there are allegations in the complaint which form the basis for the ingredients that constitute certain offences complained of. The Court may also be entitled to see (i) whether the preconditions requisite for taking cognizance have been complied with or not; and (ii) whether the allegations contained in the complaint, even if accepted in entirety, would not constitute the offence alleged.

.....

13. A look at the complaint filed by the appellant would show that the appellant had incorporated the ingredients necessary for



WEB COPY



CrI.O.P.No.3911 of 2025

prosecuting the respondents for the offences alleged.

The question whether the appellant will be able to prove the allegations in a manner known to law would arise only at a later stage....."

The above judgments are squarely applicable to this case and as such, the points raised by the petitioner are mixed question of facts and it cannot be considered in quash petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C.

9. In view of the above, this Court is not inclined to quash the proceeding in CC.No.280 of 2023 on the file of learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Thirupattur. However, the personal appearance of the petitioner before the Trial Court is dispensed with. The Trial Court is directed to complete the Trial in CC.No.280 of 2023, within a period of six months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

10. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous petition is closed.

13.02.2025

Internet: Yes



Crl.O.P.No.3911 of 2025

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non speaking order
mn

WEB COPY



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.3911 of 2025

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN. J,

mn

To

1. The Judicial Magistrate No.II,
Thirupattur.
2. The Inspector of Police,
Thirupathur Taluk Police Station,
Tirupathur District.
3. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

Crl.O.P.No.3911 of 2025

13.02.2025