



Suo Motu TR.(MD).No.13752 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATE : 19.09.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.K.RAMAKRISHNAN

Suo Motu TR.(MD).No.13752 of 2025

**(C.C.No.84 of 2018 on the file of the
Judicial Magistrate, Eraniel, Eraniel Taluk, Kanniyakumari District)**

The Sub Inspector of Police,
Eraniel.

... Petitioner

Vs.

Monsh

... Respondent

Upon perusing the documents and case records of the above
C.C.No.84 of 2018 transmitted to this Court and hearing the arguments of
Mr.S.Ravi, learned Additional Public Prosecutor, on behalf of the State,
this Court passes the following:

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*



Suo Motu TR.(MD).No.13752 of 2025

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”.

2. This Dedicated Bench has taken the **C.C.No.84 of 2018** on the file of the learned **Judicial Magistrate, Eraniel, Eraniel Taluk, Kanniyakumari District** as ***Suo motu* Special Tr.Case.(MD) No.13752 of 2025** in **Suo Motu W.P.(CrI.).(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 six years without any precedent value in this pilot project.

3. **Brief facts of the prosecution case in C.C.No.84 of 2018:**

On 07.11.2017 at about 07.30 p.m., a vehicle driven by the accused caused an accident, resulting in the death of one person. Therefore, a case was registered in **Crime No.592 of 2017** and upon completion of investigation, final report filed and the same was taken on file in **C.C.No.84 of 2018** and the same was pending without trial for more than six years.



Suo Motu TR.(MD).No.13752 of 2025

4. Discussion:

WEB COPY

4.1 Today, the learned Judicial Magistrate has appeared through video conference. The accused and the police official were present before the learned Judicial Magistrate 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 he 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 and the charged offence is punishable with **imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to two years, or with fine, or with both** and the case is pending for more than **six 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 279 and 304(A)**



Suo Motu TR.(MD).No.13752 of 2025

WEB COPY

5.Discussion on the question of sentence:-

The accused is aged about 31 years and he is unmarried and he is doing AC Mechanism work 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 victim received the compensation and he also not interested in prosecuting the case and the accused also regularly appearing before the Court for the past **six years** and also on the reiterated the principle of the Hon'ble 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.15,000/- (Rupees Fifteen Thousand only)** with default sentence of two months simple imprisonment.



Suo Motu TR.(MD).No.13752 of 2025

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 **279, 304(A) IPC** in **C.C.No.84 of 2018** on the file of the learned **Judicial Magistrate, Eraniel, Eraniel Taluk, Kanniyakumari District**.

6.2. The accused is directed to pay a fine of **Rs.15,000/- (Rupees Fifteen Thousand only)** before the learned **Judicial Magistrate, Eraniel, Eraniel Taluk, Kanniyakumari District**, and in default, he is directed to undergo two months simple imprisonment.

19.09.2025

trp

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



Suo Motu TR.(MD).No.13752 of 2025

K.K.RAMAKRISHNAN,J.

trp

Order made in
Suo Motu TR.(MD).No.13752 of 2025

19.09.2025