



Suo Motu TR.(MD).No.13936 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATE : 22.09.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.K.RAMAKRISHNAN

Suo Motu TR.(MD).No.13936 of 2025

(C.C.No.252 of 2025 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate No.II Court,
Sattur)

The Inspector of Police,
Vembakkottai Police Station,
Sattur District.

... Petitioner

Vs.

Rajagurunathan

... Respondent

Upon perusing the documents and case records of the above C.C.No. 252 of 2025 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.13936 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”.

2. This Dedicated Bench has taken the **C.C.No.252 of 2025** on the file of the **Judicial Magistrate No.II Court, Sattur** as ***Suo motu Special Tr.Case.(MD) No.13936 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 **one year** without any precedent value in this pilot project.

3. Brief facts of the prosecution case in C.C.No.252 of 2025:

In the year 2020 the accused illegally transported one unit



Suo Motu TR.(MD).No.13936 of 2025

quantity of sand in violation of the provision of the Mines Act.

Therefore, a case was registered in **Crime No.40 of 2018 for the offence punishable under Section 379 of IPC** and upon completion of investigation, final report filed and the same was taken on file in **C.C.No. 252 of 2025** and the same was pending without trial for more than **one year**.

4. Discussion:

4.1 Today, the learned Judicial Magistrate No.II Judge has appeared through video conference. The accused and the police official were present before the learned Judicial Magistrate No.II 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.13936 of 2025

and the charged offence is punishable with **imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to three years, or with fine, or with both** and the case is pending for more than **one year** 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 **Section 379 of IPC and impose a fine of Rs.10,000/-**. 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 35 years and having three children and now he is doing coolie 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 accused also regularly appearing before the Court for the past **one year** 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)***



Suo Motu TR.(MD).No.13936 of 2025

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.10,000/-** 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 **Section 379 of IPC in C.C.No.252 of 2025** on the file of the learned **Judicial Magistrate No.II Court, Sattur.**

6.2. The accused is directed to pay a fine of **Rs.10,000/-** before the **Judicial Magistrate No.II Court, Sattur**, and in default, he is directed to undergo **two months** simple imprisonment.

6.3. The accused is directed to execute the bond as to the satisfaction of the learned **Judicial Magistrate No.II Court, Sattur** under **Section 4 of the Probation Offenders Act, 1958.**

6.4. The Learned **Judicial Magistrate No.II Court, Sattur** is directed to transmit the fine amount to the District Mines and Minerals trust fund, Virudhunagar District.

22.09.2025



Suo Motu TR.(MD).No.13936 of 2025

WEB COPY

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.13936 of 2025

K.K.RAMAKRISHNAN,J.

TM

Order made in
SUO MOTU Tr.(MD).No.13936 of 2025

22.09.2025