



CrI.O.P.No. 5115 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 01.04.2025

CORAM:

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

CrI.O.P.No. 5115 of 2025

and

CrI.M.P.No.3271 of 2025

M.Kiran

.... Petitioner

Vs

1.State rep. by its
Inspector of Police,
T18 Thalambur Police Station,
Crime No.294 of 2024.

2. Bhavani Priya

.... Respondents

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to call for the records and quash the FIR against the petitioner in Cr.No.294 of 2024 in the file of the 1st respondent.

For Petitioner : Mr.T.Naveen Chandar

For R1 : Mr.A.Gopinath
Government Advocate (CrI.Side)

For R2 : Mr.Adinarayan Rao



CrI.O.P.No. 5115 of 2025

WEB COPY

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed seeking to quash the FIR registered in Crime No.294 of 2024 on the file of the first respondent.

2. The petitioner is the husband of the second respondent. They got married on 11.03.2012. Due to misunderstandings, they got separated. Now, the second respondent is living in the United States of America. The second respondent lodged a complaint alleging that the petitioner suppressed his earlier marriage and got married her on 11.03.2012. In fact, in the marriage application, he mentioned his marital status as “bachelor”. Thereafter, the second respondent came to know that the petitioner had already been married with another woman and had obtained a divorce from her.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner had already obtained a divorce from his first wife prior to marrying the second respondent and therefore there was no suppression of fact. He further submitted that the second respondent



CrI.O.P.No. 5115 of 2025

WEB COM

herself filed a divorce petition before the Court of Miami-Dade County, Miami, Florida, USA. In the said petitioner, the second respondent did not whisper about the above said allegations.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the second respondent submitted that at the time of filing the divorce petition, the second respondent not aware of the said facts. Now only the second respondent came to know about the first marriage of the petitioner and therefore, lodged the present complaint.

5. The learned Government Advocate (CrI.Side) appearing for the first respondent submitted that the investigation is still pending.

6. Heard the learned Counsel appearing on either side and perused the materials placed on record.

7. It is seen from the First Information Report that there are specific allegations as against the petitioner to attract the offences under Sections 495, 496, 420, 294(b) 509 of IPC, which has to be investigated in depth. Further the FIR is not an encyclopedia and it need not contain



CrI.O.P.No. 5115 of 2025

WEB.COM

all facts and it cannot be quashed in its 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 accordance with the procedures prescribed in the Code.

8. 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



CrI.O.P.No. 5115 of 2025

WEB COPY

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 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.

9. 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.



WEB COPY



Cr.I.O.P.No. 5115 of 2025

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 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*



WEB COPY



Cr.L.O.P.No. 5115 of 2025

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;”

10. 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 Crime No.294 of 2024 and file a final report within a period of twelve weeks from the date of receipt of copy of this order.

11. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

01.04.2025

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



CrI.O.P.No. 5115 of 2025

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN, J.

WEB COPY

Lpp

To

1. The Inspector of Police,
T18 Thalambur Police Station,
Chengalpattu.

2. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

CrI.O.P.No. 5115 of 2025

01.04.2025