



Crl.O.P.No.11412 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 17.04.2025

CORAM:

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

Crl.O.P.No.11412 of 2025

and

Crl.M.P.No.7570 of 2025

M.Saravana Kumar

... Petitioner

Vs.

The State Rep. By
The Inspector of Police,
Maduravoyal Police Station.

... Respondent

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, praying to call for the records the FIR in Crime No.1506/2020 on the file of the Respondent Police, and quash the same in the interest of justice.

For Petitioner : Mr.C.H.Paranjothi
For Respondent : Mr.A.Gopinath,
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

ORDER

This petition has been filed to quash the F.I.R. in Crime No.1506 of 2020 registered by the respondent police for offences under Section 24(1) of Cigarette and Other Tobacco Products Act and Section 328 of IPC, as against the petitioner.




WEB COPY

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 31.10.2020, the respondent police received a secret information about the transportation of tobacco products in a vehicles. Based on that secret information, the respondent police stopped the vehicle bearing Reg.No.TN 58 AS 1752 in the course of regular vehicle check up at Vanagaram, Chennai. When they checked the boxes in the vehicle, 500 kgs of tobacco produces was found. Hence, the respondent police confiscated those products and registered a case in Crime No.1506 of 2020.

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 base, the respondent police registered a case in Crime No.1506 of 2020 for the offences under Section 24(1) of Cigarette and Other Tobacco Products Act and Section 328 of IPC, as against the petitioner. Hence he prayed to quash the same.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) would submit that the investigation is almost completed and the respondent police is yet to file the final report.



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

WEB materials placed on record.


6. On a perusal of the records, it is revealed that all the accused persons were in conscious possession of prohibited tobacco products. The petitioner is arrayed as A3, and there are specific allegations against the petitioner that 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.

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 Pokarnekhar 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



WEB.COM

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 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.



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 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*



Crl.O.P.No.11412 of 2025

WEB COPY


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 2020, the respondent is directed to complete the investigation in Crime No.1506 of 2020 and file a final report within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, before the jurisdiction Magistrate, if not already filed.

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

17.04.2025

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



Crl.O.P.No.11412 of 2025

WEB COPY To

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



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.11412 of 2025

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN, J.

kv

Crl.O.P.No.11412 of 2025

17.04.2025