



Crl.O.P.No.6743 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 07.03.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN

Crl.O.P.No.6743 of 2025
and Crl.M.P.No.4304 of 2025

Rajagopal

... Petitioner

Vs

1. State Represented By
The Inspector of Police,
Jalakandapuram Police Station,
Jalagandapuram,
Salem District.

2. Keerthana

... Respondents

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023/ Section 482 of Cr.P.C, to call for the records in C.C.No.552 of 2024 pending on the file of the Judicial Magistrate - II, Mettur and quash the same.

For Petitioner : Mr.K.Sathish
For R1 : Mr.K.M.D.Muhilan
Government Advocate (Crl.side)

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed challenging the charge sheet in C.C.No.552 of 2024 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate - II, Mettur and to quash the same.



Crl.O.P.No.6743 of 2025

WEB COPY

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) for the first respondent and perused the materials placed on record.

3. The case of the prosecution is that the accused entered into the house of the defacto complainant, thereby molested her and threatened her not to reveal to anyone and also criminally intimidated her. Hence, the case.

4. After completion of investigation, the first respondent filed a final report and the same has been taken cognizance in C.C.No.552 of 2024 and it is pending for Trial on the file of the Judicial Magistrate - II, Mettur.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that there are contradictions between the witnesses and there is no specific overtact as against the petitioner.



WEB COPY

6. A perusal of the statement of the victim revealed that there is specific overtact as against the petitioner and he had committed very serious and heinous offence as against the second respondent. It is also corroborated by other witnesses.

7. A perusal of the statement of the Doctor is also clear that after cased history and general examinations of victim, the opinion of the Doctor is that there is a possibility of sexual abuse (molestation) and cut injury over the left side of the neck. Therefore, there are specific allegations as against the petitioner.

8. In this regard, it is relevant to rely upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India passed in ***Crl.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,



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.6743 of 2025

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.

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.

9. 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



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.6743 of 2025

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.

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.”

10. Further the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India also held in the order dated **02.12.2019** in **Crl.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



WEB COPY



CrI.O.P.No.6743 of 2025

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 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.

11. In view of the above, this Court is not inclined to quash the proceeding in C.C.No.552 of 2024 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate - II, Mettur. The Trial Court is directed to complete the Trial in CC.No.552 of 2024,



Crl.O.P.No.6743 of 2025

within a period of six months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

WEB COPY

12. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

Consequently, connected Miscellaneous petition is closed.

07.03.2025

Internet:Yes

Index:Yes/No

Speaking/Non speaking order

mn



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.6743 of 2025

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN. J.

mn

To

1. The Judicial Magistrate - II, Mettur.
2. The Inspector of Police,
Jalakandapuram Police Station,
Jalagandapuram,
Salem District.
3. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

Crl.O.P.No.6743 of 2025

07.03.2025