



Crl.O.P.No.6075 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.6075 of 2025
and Crl.M.P.Nos.3890 and 3891 of 2025

Rajendran @ Kutty Rajendran

... Petitioner

Vs

State Rep. By
The Inspector of Police,
PEW - Krishnagiri,
Krishnagiri District.

Criem No.873 of 2019

... Respondent

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 482 of Crl.P.C/Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to call for the records relating to the S.C.4 of 2023 on the file of the Hon'ble Asst. Sessions Judge, Krishnagiri and quash the same.

For Petitioner : M/s B.Sasikala

For Respondent : M/s J.R.Archana
Government Advocate (Crl.side)

ORDER

This petition has been filed to quash the proceeding in S.C.4 of 2023 on the file of the Assistant Sessions Judge, Krishnagiri.

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



Crl.O.P.No.6075 of 2025

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

3. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner and other accused were found in possession of 11,000 litres of rectified spirit. Hence, the complaint.

4. On receipt of the complaint, the respondent registered FIR in Crime No.873 of 2019 for the offences punishable under Sections 4(1)(aaa) and 4(1-A) of Tamil Nadu Prohibition Act, Sections 468, 471 and 420 of IPC read with Sections 6 and 7 of the Tamil Nadu Rectified Spirit Rules, 2000. After completion of investigation, the respondent filed a final report and the same has been taken cognizance in S.C.4 of 2023 on the file of the Assistant Sessions Judge, Krishnagiri.

5. It is seen that the petitioner is a habitual offender and so far he has been involved in five previous cases. Further, the petitioner raised a ground that there is a procedural irregularity. However, it is not the ground to quash the entire proceeding. That apart, the grounds raised by the petitioner can be considered only during the trial before the Trial Court.



WEB COPY

6. 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, 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.




WEB COPY

7. Recently, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India dealing in respect of the very same issue in ***CrI.A.No.1572 of 2019*** dated 17.10.2019 in the case of ***Central Bureau of Invstigation 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.

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 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 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



CrI.O.P.No.6075 of 2025

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 S.C.4 of 2023 on the file of the Assistant Sessions Judge, Krishnagiri. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous petitions are closed.

03.03.2025
($\frac{1}{2}$)

Internet: Yes
Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non speaking order
mn



Crl.O.P.No.6075 of 2025

WEB COPY

To

1. The Assistant Sessions Judge, Krishnagiri.
2. The Inspector of Police,
PEW - Krishnagiri,
Krishnagiri District.
3. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.6075 of 2025

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN. J.

mn

Crl.O.P.No.6075 of 2025

03.03.2025