



Crl.O.P.No.6184 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 05.03.2025

CORAM:

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

Crl.O.P.No.6184 of 2025

Muthaiyan

..... Petitioner

Vs

1.The Inspector of Police,
Chinnasalem Police Station,
Kallakurichi Taluk,
Kallakurichi District.

2. K.Anandh

..... Respondents

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 528 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to call for the records in Crime No.436 of 2024 on the file of the respondent police and quash the same and allowing the original petition.


For Petitioner : Mr.C.R.Gopinath

For R1 : Mr.A.Gopinath

Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed seeking to quash the FIR registered in Crime No.436 of 2024 on the file of the first respondent, for the offences under Sections 296(b), 115(2), 77, 308(2), 351(3) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 r/w.67(A) of Information



Technologies Act.

WEB COPY

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner, who works as a fortune teller, developed a close relationship with the defacto complainant, viz., the second respondent herein and his family. He expressed interest in settling in the second respondent's village and requested assistance in purchasing a plot of land. The second respondent arranged a sum of Rs.4,00,000/- to enable the petitioner to purchase the said land. During this period, the petitioner developed an illicit relationship with the second respondent's wife. Despite repeated objections and warnings, the petitioner continued the relationship. On 15.08.2024, the petitioner visited the house of the second respondent, abused his wife using filthy language, physically assaulted both the second respondent and his wife and further threatened that if the second respondent's wife did not accompany him, he would upload the photos and videos of their illicit relationship on social media. Hence, the complaint.

3. On receipt of the complaint, the first respondent



Crl.O.P.No.6184 of 2025

registered an FIR in Crime No.436 of 2024 for the offence under Sections 296(b), 115(2), 77, 308(2), 351(3) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 r/w.67(A) of Information Technologies Act.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that there is a civil dispute between the petitioner and the second respondent and a false case has been foisted as against the petitioner.

5. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the first respondent. Perused the materials available 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 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.

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



Crl.O.P.No.6184 of 2025

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.

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*



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.6184 of 2025

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;”

9. In view of the above discussions, this Court is not



Crl.O.P.No.6184 of 2025

inclined to quash the FIR in Crime No.439 of 2015 on the file of the first respondent. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed.

05.03.2025

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

To

1.The Inspector of Police
Chinnasalem Police Station,
Kallakurichi Taluk,
Kallakurichi District.

2.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN, J.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.6184 of 2025

Lpp

Crl.O.P.No.6184 of 2025

05.03.2025