



Crl.O.P.No.6284 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 06.03.2025

CORAM:

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

Crl.O.P.No.6284 of 2025
and Crl.M.P.Nos.4023 and 4025 of 2025

Shakthipriya

... Petitioner

Vs

1. State Rep.By,
The Inspector of Police,
EOW Wing Villupuram.

2. Velayutham ... Respondents

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 of the case in CC.No.43 of 2024 in Cr.No.02 of 2021 on the file of the Chief Judicial Magistrate Court, Villupuram, Villupuram District and quash the same.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Sidharthan

For R1 : M/s J.R.Archana
Government Advocate (Crl.side)

ORDER

This petition has been filed to quash the proceeding in CC.No.43 of 2024 in Cr.No.02 of 2021 on the file of the Chief Judicial Magistrate Court, Villupuram, Villupuram District.



Crl.O.P.No.6284 of 2025

WEB COPY

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

3. The case of the prosecution is that A1 viz., Siva @ Sivakumar approached the defacto complainant to invest in his chit fund company on 19 months scheme from 21.05.2019 to 21.12.2020 for an amount of Rs.2,00,000/-. Every month there will be a bid and whoever wins the bid, they will be paid with full chit amount. The monthly chit amount will be paid to A1 and during his absence, the same will be paid to the petitioner herein. The defacto complainant had paid a total sum of Rs.1,86,000/-. When the defacto complainant approached the said chit fund company for final payments, it was found that the accused had closed the chit company and absconded somewhere, thereby cheating the defacto complainant. Hence, the complaint.

4. On receipt of the complaint, the first respondent registered FIR in Crime No.02 of 2021 for the offences punishable under Sections 420 and 406 of IPC read with Section 76(1) of Chit Funds Act, 1982. After completion of investigation, the first respondent filed a final report and the same has been



Crl.O.P.No.6284 of 2025

taken cognizance in CC.No.43 of 2024 in Cr.No.02 of 2021 on the file of the Chief Judicial Magistrate Court, Villupuram, Villupuram District.

5. A perusal of statement of witnesses revealed that the petitioner is a second accused. She along with the first accused were running a chit company in the name and style of M/s Siva Finance Chit funds, at NMD Complex. She also received the amount from the victims, thereby cheating them. There are totally 37 victims. So far, the accused failed to return the amount of Rs.98,15,003/-.

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



WEB COPY



CrI.O.P.No.6284 of 2025

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.

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 Investigation 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



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.6284 of 2025

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



WEB COPY



CrI.O.P.No.6284 of 2025

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 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 CC.No.43 of 2024 on the file of Chief Judicial Magistrate Court, Villupuram, Villupuram District. The Trial Court is directed to complete the Trial in CC.No.43 of 2024, within a period of six months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

10. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous petitions are closed.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.6284 of 2025

06.03.2025
(3/4)

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



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.6284 of 2025

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN. J.

mn

To

1. The Chief Judicial Magistrate Court,
Villupuram, Villupuram District.
2. The Inspector of Police,
EOW Wing Villupuram.
3. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

Crl.O.P.No.6284 of 2025

06.03.2025