



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.14218 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT
WEB COPY

DATED : 28.08.2025

CORAM :

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE B.PUGALENDHI

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.14218 of 2025 and
Crl.MP(MD) No.11476 of 2025

K.Ramasamy

... Petitioner

Vs

1.The State of Tamil Nadu,,
Rep. by Through the Inspector of Police,
Sivagangai Town Police Station,
Sivagangai.
(Crime No. 194/2016).

2.Murugan

...Respondents

Prayer : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, to call for the records relating to FIR in Crime No.194/2016 dated 23.03.2016 on the file of the 1st respondent and quash the same as against the petitioner.

For Petitioner
For R1

: Mr. S. Mahendra Pathy,
: Mr.P.Kottaichamy
Government Advocate (Crl.side)



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.14218 of 2025

ORDER

The petitioner/A2 in Crime No.194 of 2016 has moved this petition to quash the above proceedings pending as against him. The above case has been registered as against the petitioner and one another for the offence under Sections 294(b), 468, 470 & 420 IPC, on the basis of the complaint given by the defacto complainant/ the second respondent.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the second respondent's father has purchased a property from one Mayan to an extent of 25 cents at Manakudi Village and after his demise, the second respondent has inherited the property. He has noticed that in the UDR pata, the name of the vendor has been mentioned as Solai S/o, Mayan, instead of Mayan S/o, Alagan. Taking advantage of the same, the petitioner along with A1 have fabricated the documents and also by impersonation, sold the property to the father of the second respondent. After verifying with the encumbrance, the second respondent approached the petitioner and A1 to cancel the document, for which, they have abused the defacto complainant by using filthy language. Hence, the case.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.14218 of 2025

WEB COPY

3.The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. Even as per the First Information Report, the petitioner is the bonafide purchaser and he is not having any knowledge about the forgery of documents. There is no specific overt act as against this petitioner.

4.Mr.P.Kottaichamy, learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side), who takes notice for the first respondent disputed the submissions of the petitioner's counsel and submits that there are enough materials as against this petitioner. The case is at the stage of investigation.

5.This Court considered the rival submissions made and also perused the materials placed on record.

6.The investigation in the above case is in progress. The grounds raised by these petitioner can also be appreciated by the investigation agency during the course of investigation. The investigation is the process of finding out the truth. The respondent police shall conduct the investigation in a fair manner by considering the



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.14218 of 2025

WEB COPY

grounds raised by the petitioner also. Registration of a compliant in an FIR would not cause any prejudice to the petitioner In the event, if any final report is filed as against the petitioner, it is open to the petitioner to challenge the final report in the manner known to law.

7.With the hope that the respondent police would conduct the investigation in Crime No.194 of 2016 in a fair and proper manner, this Criminal Original Petition is closed. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition is also closed.

28.08.2025

NCC : Yes/No
Index : Yes/No
Internet:Yes
vrn

To

The Inspector of Police,
Sivagangai Town Police Station,
Sivagangai.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.14218 of 2025

B.PUGALENDHI,J

vrn

Order made in
Crl.O.P.(MD)No.14218 of 2025 and
Crl.MP(MD) No.11476 of 2025

28.08.2025