



Suo Motu TR.(MD).No.10237 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATE : 13.10.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.K.RAMAKRISHNAN

Suo Motu TR.(MD).No.10237 of 2025

(S.T.C.No.888 of 2021 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate Court No.VI,
Tiruchirappalli Taluk, Tiruchirappalli)

The Sub Inspector of Police,
Ariyamangalam Town Police Station,
Trichy.
Crime No.617 of 2020

... Petitioner

Vs.

Abdul Rahuman

... Respondent

Upon perusing the documents and case records of the above
S.T.C.No.888 of 2021 transmitted to this Court and hearing the arguments
of ***Mr.S.Ravi, learned Additional Public Prosecutor*** on behalf of the State
and *hearing the concerned probation officer* this Court passes the
following



Suo Motu TR.(MD).No.10237 of 2025

ORDER

WEB COPY **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 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”.

This Dedicated Bench has taken the **S.T.C.No.888 of 2021** on the file of the **Judicial Magistrate Court No.VI, Tiruchirappalli Taluk, Tiruchirappalli** as **Suo motu Special Tr.Case.(MD) No.10237 of 2025** in **Suo Motu W.P.(Crl.).(MD).No.1014 of 2025**, upon proper scrutiny and suitability as a fit case warranting the exercise of power under Article 226 of Constitution of India to pass suitable order in the said C.C., pending more than **four years** without any precedent value in this pilot project.



Suo Motu TR.(MD).No.10237 of 2025

3. Brief facts of the prosecution case in S.T.C.No.888 of 2021:

WEB COPY

On 27.10.2020, the accused was found in illegal possession of tobacco products for sale. Therefore, a case was registered in Crime No. 704 of 2020 for the offences punishable under Sections 6(a) and 24(1) of COTP Act, and upon completion of investigation, final report filed and the same was taken on file in S.T.C.No.888 of 2021 and the same was pending without trial for more than four years.

4. Discussion:

4.1 Today, the learned Principal District Judge has appeared through video conference. The accused and the police official were present before the learned Principal District Court. The accused has filed an admission petition and pleaded guilty and seeks leniency in imposing punishment.

4.2. This Court explains the contents of the accusation to the accused, and the accused admits the contents of the admission petition and pleads guilty. Thus, this court satisfies the admission petition filed without any coercion or threat.

4.3. In view of the above admission and pleading of guilty of the accused, and considering the material allegation made in the final report did not relate to the economic and heinous offence and his conduct is good



Suo Motu TR.(MD).No.10237 of 2025

and the charged offence is punishable with **imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to four years, or with fine, or with both** and the case is pending for more than **four years** without trial and the same impinge the fair and speedy trial as envisaged under Article 21 of the Constitution of India, this Court is inclined to admit the petition and convict the accused for the offence under **Sections 6(a) and 24(1) of COTP Act, and sentenced to the imprisonment which the accused had already undergone.** There is no bar to initiate the confiscation proceedings under the relevant statutes by following the procedure stated in the relevant Act.

5. Discussion on the question of sentence:-

The accused is aged about 26 days and he is running a tea stall and he was released on station bail during Covid-19 period and he has not involved in further offence and considering the mitigating circumstances, and following the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of *Sunita Devi Vs. State of Bihar and another reported in 2014 SCC Online SC 984, 2025 INSC 1014 (K.Ponnammal Vs. State)* and also taken into account that the accused also regularly appearing before the Court and also on the reiterated the principle of the Hon'ble



Suo Motu TR.(MD).No.10237 of 2025

Supreme Court in the cases of ***M.W.Mohiuddin V. State of Maharashtra***

reported in (1995) 3 SCC 567 and B.G.Goswami V. Delhi

Administration reported in (1974) 3 SCC 85 that delay itself amounts to

punishment, which must weigh in sentencing and disposal, this court is

inclined to impose fine of **Rs.200/- (Rupees Two Hundred Only)** with

default sentence of **two months** simple imprisonment.

6. Accordingly, this *Suo Motu Special Tr.(MD).* case stands closed on the following terms:

6.1. The accused is convicted for the offence under **Sections 6(a) and 24(1) of COTP Act**, in **S.T.C.No.888 of 2021** on the file of the **Judicial Magistrate Court No.VI, Tiruchirappalli Taluk, Tiruchirappalli.**

6.2. The accused is directed to pay a fine of **Rs.200/- (Rupees Two Hundred Only)** before the **Judicial Magistrate Court No.VI, Tiruchirappalli Taluk, Tiruchirappalli**, and in default, he is directed to undergo **two months** simple imprisonment.

13.10.2025

dss

5/7



Suo Motu TR.(MD).No.10237 of 2025

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.

K.K.RAMAKRISHNAN,J.

dss

Order made in
SUO MOTU Tr.(MD).No.10237 of 2025



WEB COPY



Suo Motu TR.(MD).No.10237 of 2025

13.10.2025