



Crl.A.No.1612 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 04.12.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

Crl.A.No.1612 of 2025

A.Rajaraman ... Appellant /defacto complainant

Vs.

1. The Superintendent of Police,
Villupuram District.

2. The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Valathi Sub Division, Gingee.

3. The Inspector of Police,
Valathy Police Station,
Melmalaiyanur Taluk,
Villupuram District.

... Respondents/Complainant

Prayer: Criminal Appeal filed under Section 14-A[2] of the Scheduled Castes and Schedules Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989, praying to set aside the order dated 14.08.2025 in Crl.MP No.1694 of 2024 on the file

Page No.1 of 8



Crl.A.No.1612 of 2025

of the Special Court for Exclusive Trial of Cases Registered under the
Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act,
Villupuram to include the names of Elumalai, Koteswaran and Devaki in
the Crime No.170 of 2023 and file final report in Spl.S.C.No.04 of 2024.



WEB COPY



Crl.A.No.1612 of 2025

For Appellants : Mr.S.Lingesh
for Mr.K.G.Senthilkumar

For Respondents : Mr.S.Balaji
Govt. Advocate (Crl.side)

J U D G M E N T

This appeal has been filed challenging the Order passed by learned Special Court dismissing the petitioner/defacto complainant's petition for further investigation and include 3 other accused in the final report.

2. It is the case of the petitioner that he had lodged a complaint against 4 persons; that the respondent without conducting investigation in effective manner had deleted names of 3 accused persons and had filed final report against one accused person; that hence, he had filed a petition in Crl.M.P.No.1694 of 2024; that the Sessions Judge found that three other



WEB COPY

persons were not involved in the offence; that the finding of the Sessions judge is erroneous as the three accused have to be tried along with the accused in the final report; and prayed for further investigation.

3. The learned Government Advocate [Criminal Side] per contra submitted that the investigating officer had conducted investigation fairly; that he is not obliged to believe the statement of the defacto complainant and only on the basis of the materials available, he had filed the final report; that the learned Judge after perusing the materials had come to the right conclusion; and that there is no infirmity in the impugned Order.

4. This Court is of the view that the learned trial Judge by the impugned Order had considered the report of the respondent and held that at this stage there is no material to include the other 3 accused in the final report. This Court finds no infirmity in the said findings. However, it is



Crl.A.No.1612 of 2025

made clear that if, during the course of trial, if there is any evidence against those three persons or any other person, the learned Judge is at liberty to invoke Section 319 Cr.P.C. to summon those accused.

5. With the above observations, this Criminal Appeal is disposed of.

04.12.2025

Index : Yes/No
Speaking Order/Non Speaking Order
Neutral Citation: Yes/No
vrc

To

1.The Sessions Judge,
Special court for SC/ST Act,
Villupuram District

Page No.5 of 8



Crl.A.No.1612 of 2025

2. The Superintendent of Police,
Villupuram District.

3. The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Valathi Sub Division, Gingee.

4. The Inspector of Police,
Valathy Police Station,
Melmalaiyanur Taluk,
Villupuram District.

5. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



Crl.A.No.1612 of 2025

SUNDER MOHAN, J.

VTC

Crl.A.No.1612 of 2025



WEB COPY



Crl.A.No.1612 of 2025

04.12.2025