



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.20525 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 22.07.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P.VELMURUGAN

Crl.O.P.No.20525 of 2025 and
Crl.M.P.No.14189 of 2025

Arul Kumar

...Petitioner

Vs.

State represented by
The Inspector of Police,
District Crime Branch,
Cuddalore, Cuddalore District.

...Respondent

Prayer : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. to call for the records in C.C.No.144 of 2022 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate, Neyveli and quash the same insofar as it relates to the petitioner.

For Petitioner : Mr.J.Srinivasa Mohan
For Respondent : Dr.C.E.Pratap,
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

ORDER

This petition has been filed seeking to quash the case in C.C.No.144 of 2022 pending before the learned the Judicial Magistrate, Neyveli.



Crl.O.P.No.20525 of 2025

WEB COPY

2

Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner herein has been arrayed as A4, whose name was not in the FIR. The respondent police, at the time of filing charge sheet only included the petitioner's name as A4. The main accused is A2, who is the father of A4. As per the FIR, it is the allegation against the petitioners that A1 and A2 duped the defacto complainant of Rs.10,30,000/- under the pretext of getting a job for his son in NLC. The petitioner herein, being a son of A2, was present in the house during the meeting of A2 and the defacto complainant, which could not be a reason to rope the petitioner herein. Even there is no specific overt act as against the petitioner either in the complaint or in the statement of witnesses. Therefore the case against the petitioner herein has to be quashed.

3

Learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) for the respondent police would submit that there are specific allegations against this petitioner and investigation also revealed that this petitioner involved in the offence and hence the respondent police laid charge sheet including the name of the petitioner.



Crl.O.P.No.20525 of 2025

WEB COPY

4 Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner/A4 and the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) for the respondent and perused the materials available on record.

5 It is seen that even though as contended by the learned counsel for the petitioner that name of the petitioner was not found place in the FIR, but, subsequent investigation revealed that the petitioner also involved in the offence. The FIR's primary purpose is to initiate the criminal law process, and it doesn't require a comprehensive list of all individuals involved. Therefore the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner is not acceptable. Further the witnesses have clearly spoken about the involvement of this petitioner. Therefore this Court is not inclined to quash the case against the petitioner.



Crl.O.P.No.20525 of 2025

WEB COPY

6 Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed. Consequently connected miscellaneous petition is closed. However, the petitioner is at liberty to take all his defence before the trial Court.

22.07.2025

cgi
Speaking /Non-speaking order

To

1. The Judicial Magistrate, Neyveli.
2. The Inspector of Police, District Crime Branch, Cuddalore, Cuddalore District.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.20525 of 2025

P.VELMURUGAN, J.

cgi

Crl.O.P.No.20525 of 2025

22.07.2025