



Crl. O.P. No. 5990 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 03.03.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN

Crl. O.P. No. 5990 of 2025

and

Crl. M.P. No. 3840 of 2025

Rajkumar

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.State rep., by
The Sub Inspector of Police,
Kachirapalayam Police Station,
Villupuram District.
(Crime No. 251 of 2016)

2.Kandasamy

... Respondents

Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 528 of B.N.S.S.,
to call for the records in Crime No. 251 of 2016 on the file of the first
respondent and quash the same as against the petitioner.

For Petitioner : Mr. A. Karthikeyan

For Respondents : Mr. A. Gopinath, for R1
Government Advocate

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed to quash the FIR
registered in Crime No.251 of 2016 on the file of the first respondent.



Crl. O.P. No. 5990 of 2025

2. The petitioner and others had received a sum of Rs.19 lakhs from the victims, in order to get job. On receipt of the said huge amount, the petitioner and others failed to obtain any job and also refused to return the above amount mentioned. Hence, the complaint.

3. Mr. A. Gobinath, learned Government Advocate appearing for the first respondent on instructions submitted that after registration of FIR, the FIR has been transferred to the file of Inspector of Police, District Crime Branch, Villupuram for further investigation.

4. That apart, there are specific allegations to constitute the offence under Sections 420, 294(b) and 506(2) of IPC as against the petitioner and others.


5. 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



Crl. O.P. No. 5990 of 2025

investigation. The investigating machinery has to step into investigate, grab and unearth the crime in accordance with the procedures prescribed in the Code.

6. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India passed 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 take 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



Crl. O.P. No. 5990 of 2025

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 not 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.

7. 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;*



WEB COPY



CrI. O.P. No. 5990 of 2025

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 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*



WEB COPY



Crl. O.P. No. 5990 of 2025


has to permit the investigating agency/police to investigate the allegations in the FIR;”

8. In view of the above discussions, this Court is not inclined to quash the First Information Report. However, considering the crime is of the year 2016, the Inspector of Police, District Crime Branch, Villupuram is directed to complete the investigation in Crime No.251 of 2016 and file a final report within a period of twelve weeks from the date of receipt of copy of this Order, before the jurisdiction Magistrate, if not already filed.

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

03.03.2025

Index : Yes / No
AT



Crl. O.P. No. 5990 of 2025

To

WEB COPY

1. The Inspector of Police,
District Crime Branch, Villupuram
2. The Sub Inspector of Police,
Kachirapalayam Police Station,
Villupuram District.
2. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



Crl. O.P. No. 5990 of 2025

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN,J.

AT

Crl. O.P. No. 5990 of 2025 and
Crl. M.P. No. 3840 of 2025

03.03.2025