



Crl.O.P.No. 12812 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 25.04.2025

CORAM:

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

Crl.O.P.No. 12812 of 2025

and

Crl.M.P.No.8477 of 2025

1.Ravichandiran

2.Vasuki

3.Vasundra

.... Petitioners

Vs

1.State rep. by
Special Sub Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch,
Coimbatore City,
Coimbatore.
Cr.No.56 of 2024.

2.A. Tamil Selvan

.... Respondents

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 482 of Code of Criminal Procedure, to call for records in Crime No.56 of 2024 on the file of the 1st respondent and quash the same.

For Petitioners : Mr.Suresh Babu
for Mr.G.Gokul

For R1 : Mr.A.Gopinath
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)



Crl.O.P.No. 12812 of 2025


WEB COPY

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed seeking to quash the FIR registered in Crime No.56 of 2024 for the offence under Sections 406, 420, 120B of IPC.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the second respondent, who was previously a dealer of TMT bars under the brand “Surya TMT”, manufactured by petitioner's company viz., Sri Padma Balaji Steels Pvt. Ltd, subsequently started his own company M/s.ATS Steel industries PVT Ltd., which did not have its own manufacturing facility. He entered into an agreement with petitioner's company to manufacture TMT bars under the new brand name “ATS TMT” and paid an advance of Rs.3 Crores on various dates, which was duly recorded in the books of accounts of the petitioner's company. Subsequently, the petitioner's company underwent Corporate Insolvency Resolution Process and was later ordered into liquidation by NCLT, Chennai, by orders dated 11.09.2017 and 05.03.2018, thereby prohibiting any transaction involving its assets.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner



Crl.O.P.No. 12812 of 2025

submitted that even according to the second respondent, the amount in question was returned. He further submitted that the dispute is civil in nature and does not attract any criminal liability.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the first respondent submitted that based on the complaint lodged by the second respondent, the first respondent registered an FIR in crime No.56 of 2024 for the offence under Sections 406, 420, 120B of IPC. He further submitted that the investigation is still pending.

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. 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 the threshold. This Court finds that the FIR discloses prima facie commission of cognizable offence and as such this Court cannot interfere with the



Crl.O.P.No. 12812 of 2025

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 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



Crl.O.P.No. 12812 of 2025

WEB COPY

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.

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*



WEB COPY



CrI.O.P.No. 12812 of 2025

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 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



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No. 12812 of 2025

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, the first respondent is directed to complete the investigation in Crime No.56 of 2024 and file a final report within a period of twelve weeks from the date of receipt of copy of this Order.

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

25.04.2025

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



WEB COPY

To

1.The Special Sub Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch,
Coimbatore City,
Coimbatore.

2.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



Crl.O.P.No. 12812 of 2025

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN, J.

Lpp

Crl.O.P.No. 12812 of 2025

25.04.2025