



Crl.O.P.No.11121 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

WEB COPY

DATED: 16.04.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN

Crl.O.P.No.11121 of 2025
and Crl.M.P.No.7358 of 2025

1.A.Kavi Kumar

2.J.Vinoth

3.V.Deepa

... Petitioners

Vs

1. State represented by
The Inspector of Police,
Namakkal Police Station,
Namakkal District.

2. M.Riyaskhan
Sub-Inspector of Police,
Thiruverumbudur Police Station,
Trichy District.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 528 Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to call for the records culminating Crime No.83 of 2025 pending on the file of the Namakkal Police Station, Namakkal District and quash the same.

For Petitioners : Mr.B.Mohan

For R1 : Mr.A.Gopinath

Government Advocate (Crl.Side)



Crl.O.P.No.11121 of 2025

WEB COPY

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed to quash the FIR in Crime No.83 of 2025 on the file of the first respondent police.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) for the first respondent and perused the materials available on record.

3. The case of the prosecution is that, while the defacto complainant was performing his official duty in connection with the search for a suspect, one Veera @ Veerakumar, on 15.02.2025, the said suspect was found in a Maruthi Suzuki Swift car bearing registration number TN 88 H 8778. When the defacto complainant attempted to apprehend the suspect, the petitioners herein intercepted him and entered into a wordy quarrel with the police officials, thereby obstructing the defacto complainant in discharge of his official duties. Hence, the complaint.



4. On receipt of the complaint, the first respondent registered FIR in Crime No.83 of 2025 for the offences punishable under Sections 191(2), 296(b), 262, 263, 132 and 351(2) of BNS, 2023.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners are arrayed as A2 to A4. The first accused is the accused in Crime No.38 of 2025 for the offences punishable under Sections 296(b), 115(2), 303(2), 308(2), 336(2), 336(3) and 340(2) of BNS, 2023 read with Section 4 of TN Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act. The present FIR has been filed when the second respondent and his team came to arrest the first accused, the petitioners had resisted them from arresting the first accused. The third petitioner is the wife of the first accused, the first accused is the brother of the second accused. Therefore, there is no overtact as against the petitioners and prayed to quash the FIR.


6. On instructions, the learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) appearing for the first respondent submitted that the first petitioner is arrayed as second accused and he is a history sheeter. At the time of arresting the first accused, all the petitioners herein resisted the police officials from arresting the



first accused, scolded them with filthy language and also threatened them with dire consequences.

7. A perusal of FIR revealed that there are specific allegations as against the accused to constitute the offences under Sections 191(2), 296(b), 262, 263, 132 and 351(2) of BNS, 2023. That apart, now, it is in FIR stage, 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.

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 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 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.



WEB COPY

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. 7

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;*



CrI.O.P.No.11121 of 2025

WEB COPY

.....
(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;*

10. In view of the above discussions, this Court is not inclined to quash the First Information Report in Crime No.83 of 2025, on the file of the respondent police. The first respondent is directed to complete the investigation in Crime No.83 of 2025 and file a final report, within a period of twelve weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

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

16.04.2025

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

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN. J.



WEB COPY



CrI.O.P.No.11121 of 2025

mn

To

1. The Inspector of Police,
Namakkal Police Station,
Namakkal District.
2. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

CrI.O.P.No.11121 of 2025

16.04.2025