

Crl.OP.No.7315 of 2025

WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated : 22.04.2025

CORAM:

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

Crl.O.P.No.7315 of 2025
and Crl.MP.No.4682 of 2025

M.Praveen

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The State Represented by
Inspector of Police,
Ulundurpet Police Station,
Villupuram District.

2.Surya

... Respondents

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 528 of BNSS to call for the records in connection with FIR in Crime No.235 of 2019 dated 20.04.2019 on the file of the respondent police and quash the same.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Saravana Kumar

For Respondents : Mr.R.Vinoth Raja
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)
for R1
: Mr.P.Jayachandran for R2



Crl.OP.No.7315 of 2025

WEB COPY

ORDER

This petition has filed to quash the FIR registered in Cr.No.235 of 2019 on the file of the first respondent.

2. On the compliant lodged by the second respondent, the first respondent registered an FIR as against the petitioner in Cr.NNo.235 of 2019 for the offences punishable under Sections 147, 294(b), 323 and 506(1) of IPC, alleging that on 19.04.2019 at about 07.30 a.m., when he was working in public toilet at Ulundurpet Bus stand. The petitioner since there are having previous enmity with the contractor Murugavel, all the accused are joined together, had abused filthy language and made criminal intimidation and also attacked the defacto complainant. As a result, he had sustained injuries and admitted in this Government Hospital, Ulundurpet.

3. The learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is an innocent person and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. Without any



Crl.OP.No.7315 of 2025


WEB COPY

base, the first respondent police registered a case in Crime No.235 of 2019 for the offences under Sections 147, 294(b), 323 and 506(1) of IPC of IPC, as against the petitioner. Hence he prayed to quash the same.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) would submit that after receipt of complaint of the complaint, the investigation was commenced. While investigation, the offences have been altered in to Section 307 of IPC. That apart, the investigation is almost completed and the respondent police have only to file final report.

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

6. It is seen from the First Information Report that there are specific allegations as against the petitioner to attract the offence as alleged by the first respondent, which has to be investigated in depth. Further the FIR is not an encyclopedia and it need not contain all



Crl.OP.No.7315 of 2025

WEB COPY

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

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



Crl.OP.No.7315 of 2025

WEB COPY

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 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.



Crl.OP.No.7315 of 2025

WEB COPY

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 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*



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.7315 of 2025

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 inclined to quash the First Information Report. However, considering the crime is of the year 2019, the first respondent is directed to complete the investigation in Crime No.235 of 2018 and file a final report within a period of three months from the date of receipt of copy of this Order, before the jurisdiction Magistrate, if not already filed.



Crl.OP.No.7315 of 2025

WEB COPY

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

22.04.2025

Vv

To

1. The Inspector of Police,
Ulundurpet Police Station,
Villupuram District.
2. The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court,
Chennai.



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.7315 of 2025

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN, J.

Vv

Crl.O.P.No.7315 of 2025

22.04.2025