



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATE : 25.08.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.K.RAMAKRISHNAN

Suo Motu TR.(MD).No. 64 of 2025

S.T.C.No.1000603 of 2018

(On the file of the Judicial Magistrate No.III, Dindigul Taluk, Dindigul)

The Inspector of Police,
Town South Police Station,
Dindigul
in Cr.No.353/2016

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. Ramesh Kumar
2. Fathima Babu

... Respondents

ORDER

Prelude:

“This dedicated bench is for implementing the pilot project to identify and dispose of criminal cases involving offences punishable with imprisonment up to 3 years pending at trial, appeal or revision stage for more than 3 years and also offences like Section 506(ii) of IPC and



WEB COPY

others , which may carry a punishment of more than 3 years in the State of Tamil Nadu with reference to the 14 Districts coming under the Madurai Bench of Madras High Court”.

2.This Dedicated Bench has taken the S.T.C.No.1000603 of 2018 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate No.III, Dindigul Taluk, Dindigul as *Suo motu* Special Tr.Case.(MD).No.64 of 2025 in *Suo Motu* W.P.(CrI.). (MD).No.1014 of 2025, upon proper scrutiny and considering its suitability that it is a fit case warranting the exercise of power under Article 226 of Constitution of India to quash the said S.T.C., which is pending for more then 7 years in this pilot project without progress.

3. Brief facts of the prosecution case in S.T.C.No.1000603 of 2018

On 30.04.2016 at about 09.05 pm., the accused is said to have installed the flex after the election hour within the prohibited distance by violating the election conduct by violating the election conduct. Therefore, a case was registered in Crime No.353 of 2016 and on investigation, final report was filed and the same was taken on file in S.T.C.No.1000603 of 2018 under Sections 188, 294(b) of IPC r/w 4A(1)(a) and 4B Tamilnadu



Open Place of Disfigurement Act, 1959 and the same is pending without trial for more than seven years.

4. Discussion:

4.1. The accused protested in democratic manner and raised slogans against the Government to ventilate their grievance. There is no material available to show that a promulgation order was in force at the relevant point of time. In view of the law laid down by this Court in the cases reported in **2025 INSC 1009, 2018 LW(cri) 606** and **Crl.O.P.(MD).No. 7977 of 2019**, it is well settled that cognizance of the offence under section 188, 294(b) of IPC r/w 4A(1)(a) and 4B Tamilnadu Open Place of Disfigurement Act, 1959 cannot be taken by the magistrate unless there is a complaint given by the public servant. Apart from that there was no material available on record to constitute the offence under section 143, 341 of IPC.

4.2. The occurrence took place long before in the year 2016 and hence, examination of the Government Officials is an impossible task and peace is restored and the case is pending without trial for three years and



the offences are trivial in nature and continuation of the trial by examining the Government Officials would lead to wastage of the time and waste of Government exchequer and also leads to docket explosion without adjudication and the chance of conviction even after the full-fledged trial is also bleak.

4.3. Under Article 227 of Constitution of India it is also the duty of this Court to have power of superintendence to reduce the pendency of the trial Court by exercising inherent power to quash the cases of this nature in order to save the precious judicial time of the trial Court and the valuable time of the investigating agency and prosecution agency in the appropriate cases.

4. In view of the above reasoning, this court exercising the *Suo Motu Power* has taken the S.T.C.No.1000**603** of 2018 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate No.III, Dindigul Taluk, Dindigul as a Special Transfer Case and inclined to exercise the inherent power under section 482 of Cr.P.C. to quash the proceedings of S.T.C.No.1000**603** of 2018 on factual matrix of the facts of this case in the interest of justice.



WEB COPY

5. In view of the above discussion on facts as well as law, continuation of the proceedings will not serve any purpose and hence, the proceedings in S.T.C.No.1000**603** of 2018 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate No.III, Dindigul Taluk, Dindigul is liable to be quashed.

6.Observation:

This Court suo motu called for the records and exercised its power under Section 482 Cr.P.C. and quash the same and hence this verdict does not confer any right to any of the accused or any party to file a case against the Investigating Agency for malicious prosecution or claim of damages.

7. Precedent Value:

The observations, discussions and decision made in this particular case can not be quoted as precedent in the cases arising in future as the decision has been taken in this suomoto writ based on factual and legal basis of this particular case.



WEB COPY

8. Accordingly, this Suo Motu Transfer case stands allowed and the S.T.C.No.1000603 of 2018 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate No.III, Dindigul Taluk, Dindigul is quashed.

25.08.2025

sbn

Note to the Trial Court: This order is digitally signed and communicated electronically alone. The Trial Court shall take note of the order and accordingly classify the case pending before them as allowed / dismissed / disposed of, etc, and while doing so, consider any applications such as disposal of properties, etc., and pass appropriate orders, as may be necessary. Further, the Court below is directed to dispatch the copy of this order to all concerned.



WEB COPY



K.K.RAMAKRISHNAN,J.

sbn

Order made in
SUO MOTU Tr. (MD).No.64 of 2025

25.08.2025