



Crl.O.P.No. 12380 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 24.04.2025

WEB COPY

CORAM:

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

Crl.O.P.No.12380 of 2025

Thangavelu

..... Petitioner

Vs

1. The State Represented by
The Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch-II,
Coimbatore City.
(Crime No.4 of 2024).

2. Ramakrishnan

..... Respondents

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to call for the records of Crime No.4 of 2024 on the file of the respondent police and quash the same.

For Petitioner	: Mr.M.Simon
For R1	: Mr.A.Gopinath Government Advocate (Crl.Side)
For R2	: Mr.C.Mohanraj.

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed seeking to quash the FIR registered in Crime No.4 of 2024 on the file of the respondent police.



Crl.O.P.No. 12380 of 2025

2. The case of the prosecution is that A1 executed a power of attorney in favour of A2 in respect of the property comprised in Survey Nos.31/3, 31/4, admeasuring 4400 sq.ft, situated at Plot Nos.70 & 71, Chinnavedampatti Village, Coimbatore Taluk, by impersonating the original owner, viz, Ramakrishnan. The said power of attorney was registered vide Document No.6643 of 2022 with A3 & A4 were shown as witnesses. On the strength of the said power of attorney, A2 executed a sale deed in favour of the petitioner. Hence, the complaint.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is an innocent and he has been falsely implicated in this case. He further submitted that he has no way connected to the offences as alleged by the prosecution. He specifically contended that the petitioner is a bonafide purchaser.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the first respondent police submitted that based on the complaint, an FIR was registered in Crime No.4 of 2024 for the offences under Sections 120(B), 419, 465, 467, 468, 471 & 420 of IPC. He further submitted that the investigation is still pending.



Crl.O.P.No. 12380 of 2025

5. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the first respondent. Perused the materials available on record.

6. A perusal of the records reveals that, pending complaint, the petitioner executed the sale deed in respect of part of the property, which was purchased by him. Further, there are specific allegations as against the petitioner to attract the offences under Sections 120(B), 419, 465, 467, 468, 471 & 420 of IPC.

7. 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 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.



Crl.O.P.No. 12380 of 2025

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



Crl.O.P.No. 12380 of 2025

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.

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.

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*



WEB COPY



CrI.O.P.No. 12380 of 2025

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



Crl.O.P.No. 12380 of 2025

WEB CONTENT

10. In view of the above discussions, this Court is not inclined to quash the First Information Report. However, the first respondent is directed to complete the investigation in Crime No.4 of 2024 and file a final report within a period of twelve weeks from the date of receipt of copy of this order.

11. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed.

24.04.2025

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

To

1. The Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch-II,
Coimbatore City.

2. The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court,
Chennai.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No. 12380 of 2025

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN, J.

Lpp

Crl.O.P.No. 12380 of 2025

24.04.2025