



*Crl.R.C(MD)No.1060 of 2025*

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: **20.11.2025**

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE **MR.JUSTICE SHAMIM AHMED**

CRL.R.C.(MD)No.1060 of 2025

The State of Tamil Nadu,  
Represented by its,  
The Inspector of Police,  
Keelavalavu Police Station,  
Madurai,  
Cr.No.223 of 2013

...Revision Petitioner/Complainant

vs.

1. SELVI, W/o.Palanisamy  
379, Sarveshvar Kovil Street  
Anna Nagar, Madurai.

2. SIVARANJANI, W/o.A.Maharajan  
379, Sarveshvar Kovil Street  
Anna Nagar,  
Madurai.

3. CHANDRALEKHA, W/o.P.Senthilkumar  
379, Sarveshvar Kovil Street  
Anna Nagar, Madurai.

... Respondents/Accused No.8, 12 and 13

**PRAYER:** Criminal Revision Petition is filed under Section 438 r/w 442 of BNSS, 2023, to call for the records pertaining to the common order



*Crl.R.C(MD)No.1060 of 2025*

dated 27.03.2023 made in Crl.M.P.No.2353 of 2022 in Spl.S.C.No.39 of 2021 on the file of the learned Special Court to Deal with the Cases of Offences in Contravention of the Provisions of the Mines & Minerals (D&R) Act, Madurai and set aside the same and against the discharge of the Respondents 2 and 3/Accused-A12 and 13, by allowing this Criminal Revision Petition.

For Revision Petitioner : Mr.A.S.Abul Kalam Azad  
Government Side

For Respondent : Mr.Ananda Padmanabhan  
Senior Counsel  
Assisted by,  
Mr.R.Ramachandran

\*\*\*\*\*

## **ORDER**

Heard Mr.Abul Kalam Azad, learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) appearing for the Revision Petitioner and Mr.N.Anandha Padmanabhan, learned Senior Counsel assisted by Mr.R.Ramachandran, learned Counsel for the Respondent.



*Crl.R.C(MD)No.1060 of 2025*

2. This Criminal Revision Petition has been filed by the Revision Petitioner/State to call for the records pertaining to the common order dated 27.03.2023 made in Crl.M.P.No.2353 of 2022 in Spl.S.C.No.39 of 2021 on the file of the learned Special Court to Deal with the Cases of Offences in Contravention of the Provisions of the Mines & Minerals (D&R) Act, Madurai and set aside the same and against the discharge of the Respondents 2 and 3/Accused-A12 and A13, by allowing this Criminal Revision Petition.

3. The facts of the case in a nutshell, led to filing of this Criminal Revision Petition and necessary for disposal of the same, are as follows:-

- (a) The case of the prosecution is that the investigation had begun based on the complaint given by VAO, Mr. Ravichandrababu, that the accused persons namely Pallava Granite and PRP Granites and their partners and shareholders, who had taken the property through lease and indulged in quarry works, had illegally entered into the vaaikal poramboke land in S.No.66/11, sirumaanickam



*Crl.R.C(MD)No.1060 of 2025*

WEB COPY

pond S.No.380, 66/7B, 66/12D and 69/7B and encroached the non-leased Government property, removed boundary stones with machineries and illegally quarried the granite stones by using explosive substances and committed theft of the granite stones and hence, the accused have damaged 1592.32M<sup>2</sup> of Govt land and caused wrongful loss to the Government to the tune of Rs. 6.37 Crores as per the Evaluation Report and Rs. 1.45 Lakhs as per the damage certificate issued by the authorities. The defacto-complainant also got to know of the crime from his predecessor Mr. Parthiban and Mr.Subburaj and village assistant Mr.Asokan and Mr. Muruganantham had visited the crime scene in person and found out there had been deep pit dug by the accused and the area was without the boundary stones. Under the instructions of the District collector, the complainant preferred the complaint to take action against the accused person.

(b)Based on the above complaint, a case was registered in Cr.No. 223/2013 U/s 147, 379, 447 IPC r/w 3(i) of TNPPDL Act, 4(1),



*Crl.R.C(MD)No.1060 of 2025*

WEB COPY

4(1) (A), 21, 23 of MMDR Act and 4 of Explosive Substances Act against the accused persons A1 to A28.

(c) After the completion of the investigation, a final report was filed before the Judicial Magistrate, Melur and the same was taken on file vide P.R.C.No.05/2017 dated 20.01.2017. Later the case was committed before Learned Special Court to Deal with the Cases of Offences in Contravention of the Provisions of the Mines & Minerals (D&R) Act, Madurai and assigned in Spl.S.C.No.39 of 2021. Thereafter, Accused persons Selvi/A8, Sivaranjani/A12 and Chandralekha/A13 filed discharge petitions before the Learned Special Court to Deal with the cases of Offences in Contravention of the Provisions of the Mines & Minerals (D&R) Act, Madurai and by the common order, dated 27.03.2023 in Crl.M.P.No.2353 of 2022 in Spl.S.C.No.39 of 2021, the Trial Court discharged the Respondents 2 and 3/Accused A12 & 13, namely, Sivarajini and Chandralekha.

(d) The Trial court, after considering the materials placed before it,



*Crl.R.C(MD)No.1060 of 2025*

WEB COPY

was pleased to discharge the Respondents 2 and 3/Accused-A12 & A13 for the offences framed against them, in Spl.SC.No.39 of 2021 dated 27.03.2023. Hence, this Criminal Revision Case has been filed by the State of Tamil Nadu, seeking to set aside the common order, dated 27.03.2023.

4. When the matter was taken up on 25.09.2025, on the request of both Counsel, the Court granted time to the learned Counsel for the Revision Petitioner as well as the learned Counsel for the Respondent to file a counter affidavit and a rejoinder affidavit in the present Criminal Revision Petition. Thereafter, the matter was adjourned on various dates to enable the filing of the counter and rejoinder affidavits. Today, when the matter was taken up, both the counter affidavit and the rejoinder affidavit have been filed, and the same are on record. The pleadings between the parties are thus complete and both the Counsel ready to argue the case finally today.



*Crl.R.C(MD)No.1060 of 2025*

5. Mr.A.S.Abul Kalam Azad, learned Government Advocate for the Revision Petitioner/State, submits that the prosecution examined four eyewitnesses and produced the final report along with the damage certificate issued by the competent authority. The testimonies of the prosecution witnesses are consistent, and their statements clearly establish the involvement of the Accused beyond all reasonable doubt. However, the learned Trial Court disregarded these testimonies altogether.

6. The learned Government Advocate further submits that the Trial Court, in its common order dated 27.03.2023 partly and wholly discharging the Accused, erred in stating that there was no specific overt act attributed to the Respondents. It is contended that all the Accused are partners of the accused firm and were present at the scene of occurrence. They had clearly instructed the other accused persons to carry out the illegal mining activities, encroach upon Government property, and damage the Kanmais, thereby obstructing agricultural operations.



*Crl.R.C(MD)No.1060 of 2025*

WEB COPY

7. The learned Government Advocate further submits that the learned Trial Court, by a common judgment and order dated 27.03.2023 in Crl.M.P.No.2353 of 2022 in Spl.S.C.No.39 of 2021 on the file of the learned Special Court to deal with cases of offences under the Mines and Minerals (Development and Regulation) Act, Madurai, has, without proper application of mind, discharged the Respondents 2 and 3/ Sivaranjani/A12 & Chandralekha/A13, from the aforesaid criminal case. The Trial Court failed to consider the entire evidence on record, including the statements of witnesses and other relevant materials available against the Respondents 2 and 3/ Sivaranjani/A12 & Chandralekha/A13, despite clear indications of their involvement in the alleged crime.

8. He further contended that the complaint was rightly filed against the Respondent, as four witnesses, who were eyewitnesses to the incident, spoke about their direct involvement in the offence alleged by the prosecution. In particular, the eyewitnesses, namely, LW.6,



*Crl.R.C(MD)No.1060 of 2025*

Muthalagu, LW.8, Pandi stated that in the year 2009, on the first day of May at about 10.00 hours the Respondents/Selvi/A8, Sivaranjai/A12 and Chandralekha/A13, along with the other accused, came to quarry of Pallava Granite Company and PRP Granite Company, situated at Sirumanickam and trespassed into vaikkal poramboke land S.F.No.66/11 and engaged in overt acts constituting the alleged offence.

9. Thus, the learned Government Advocate contended that the Respondents had clearly involved in the alleged crime, and the order passed by the Trial Court is erroneous, illegal, and liable to be set aside. The Trial Court wrongly discharged the Respondents 2 and 3/ Sivaranjani/A12 & Chandralekha/A13 from the alleged offence, even though all the accused are equally liable under the principle of ***vicarious liability***. The learned Government Advocate therefore submits that the Respondents 2 and 3/ Sivaranjani/A12 & Chandralekha/A13, along with the other accused persons, are responsible for ***vicarious liability*** in connection with the commission of the alleged offence.



*Crl.R.C(MD)No.1060 of 2025*

WEB COPY

10. Mr.N.Anandha Padmanabhan, learned Senior Counsel for the Respondent submits that the Trial Court has rightly passed the common order dated 27.03.2023 in Crl.M.P. No. 2353 of 2022 in Spl.S.C. No. 39 of 2021 on the file of the learned Special Court dealing with offences under the Mines and Minerals (Development and Regulation) Act, Madurai, discharging the Respondents 2 and 3/ Sivaranjani/A12 & Chandralekha/A13. The order of discharge passed in favour of the Respondents 2 and 3/ Sivaranjani/A12 & Chandralekha/A13 is reasoned and well-considered, having been made after examining the entire material on record. It is further contended by the learned Senior Counsel that the present Criminal Revision Petition filed by the State against the said order amounts to an abuse of the process of law. He further submits that no overt act connects the Respondents 2 and 3/ Sivaranjani/A12 & Chandralekha/A13, with the alleged offence.



*Crl.R.C(MD)No.1060 of 2025*

11. The learned Senior Counsel for the Respondents 2 and 3/  
Sivaranjani/A12 & Chandralekha/A13 further submits that the  
allegations against them are entirely false, fabricated, and vague, and are  
based on erroneous premises. The Respondents/Selvi/A8,  
Sivaranjani/A12 & Chandralekha/A13 categorically deny having  
committed the alleged acts. It is further submitted that the complaint was  
lodged by an unauthorized person on 10.08.2012, after an unexplained  
delay, thereby casting serious doubt on the credibility of the allegations.

12. It was further argued by the learned Senior Counsel for the  
Respondents 2 and 3/, Sivaranjani/A12 & Chandralekha/A13 that none  
of the alleged eye-witnesses were the originators of the complaint filed  
by the de-facto complainant. There is no material to show that these so-  
called eye-witnesses ever communicated with the inspecting team, nor is  
there any evidence indicating that they were identified during the  
inspection. The statements attributed to these witnesses surfaced years  
after the alleged incident; as such, they do not inspire confidence and



*Crl.R.C(MD)No.1060 of 2025*

appear to be subsequent, fabricated versions introduced merely to bolster the prosecution's case. Furthermore, it was contended that the prosecution has offered no explanation for the prolonged silence of these witnesses, assuming their presence at the scene. This unexplained delay in bringing forth their statements further undermines the credibility of their evidence.

13. It was further argued by the learned Senior Counsel that the statements of the witnesses appear to be almost identical in language, structure, and narration, differing only with respect to the names and addresses of the witnesses. Such parroted and verbatim statements, which read as mere “copy-and-paste” reproductions, cannot, at the stage of framing of charges, be treated as credible material demonstrating independent recollection or establishing any specific role of the Respondents 2 and 3/ Sivaranjani/A12 & Chandralekha/A13. This mechanical uniformity materially weakens the evidentiary foundation of the prosecution’s case and reinforces the absence of any distinct allegation attributable to the Respondents 2 and 3/ Sivaranjani/A12 &



*Crl.R.C(MD)No.1060 of 2025*

Chandralekha/A13.

WEB COPY

14. The learned Senior Counsel further argued that no action has ever been initiated under the Tamil Nadu Land Encroachment Act, 1905. The FIR does not mention any eyewitnesses, and even though it is stated that eyewitnesses were present, none of them lodged a complaint or served as the source of the FIR. Sivarajini who was made as an accused in this case, was about 11 years old and present at the scene. She was seen nodding her head in response to her father's query to start work today and therefore, cannot be held liable for prosecution. In the absence of the names of eyewitnesses in the FIR, it appears that the statements given by the witnesses are identical except for their names and addresses. There are no other allegations against the Respondents 2 and 3/ Sivaranjani/A12 & Chandralekha/A13, and the mere presence of the accused became the subject of a complaint only in 2012, following an unexplained delay of seven years and eight months.



*Crl.R.C(MD)No.1060 of 2025*

15. Considering the submissions as advanced by the learned Government Advocate for the Revision Petitioner and learned Senior Counsel for the Respondents 2 and 3/Sivaranjani/A12 & Chandralekha/A13 and perused the material on record.

16. It is relevant to extract the common order passed by the learned Trial Court dated 27.03.2023 made in Crl.M.P.No.2353 of 2022 in Spl.S.C.No.39 of 2021 on the file of the learned Special Court to Deal with the Cases of Offences in Contravention of the Provisions of the Mines & Minerals (D&R) Act, Madurai, whereby the Respondents 2 and 3/ Sivaranjani/A12 & Chandralekha/A13 were discharged from the alleged offence. The reference is given at paragraph no.36 of the common order dated 27.03.2023, which is reproduced hereunder:

“36. In the case in Spl.S.C.39/2021, four witnesses have been referred to as eye witnesses who would speak about the involvement of all the accused in the offences alleged by the prosecution. So far as the statements of the eye witnesses namely (L.W.6) Muthalagu S/o Nallu and (L.W.8) Pandi S/o Karuppaiah are concerned, it has been stated that in the year of 2009 on the first day of May at about 10.00 hours the petitioners-accused along with the other accused came to



quarries of Pallava Granite Company and PRP Granite Company situate in Sirumanickam, and trespassed into the Vaikkal puramboke land situate in S.F.No.66/11 of Keelavalavu Village adjoining Pallava Granite Quarry. So far as the specific overt act on the part of these petitioners-accused is concerned, the eye witnesses would state as follows: “Kannan was standing there showed the porambake site that this place is full of good stones. Palanichamy told we will take care and looked at his daughter Sivaranjani and asked shall we start the work tomorrow? And she said we will start today itself after worshipping God. Chandralekha and Palanichamy's wife Selvi told that Sivaranjani statement is correct.” So far as the statements of the eye witnesses namely (L.W.7) Thangaraj S/o. Veeranan Ambalam and (L.W.9) Mayalagu S/o. Alagan are concerned they would attribute the following overt act as Follows: &quot;Then Gandhi and Thavaselvam brought explosive substance Ganesan took from them the same and filled the holes. Subba Reddy, Shilaja Reddy, Palanichamy, Selvi, Senthil Kumar, Suresh Kumar, Maharajan, Arumugam, Shanmuganathan, Pugalenth, Paramasivam and Subbiah instigated Genesan to blast the site quickly.&quot; As per the above statement<sup>36</sup>. In the case in Spl.S.C.39/2021, four witnesses have been referred to as eye witnesses who would speak about the involvement of all the accused in the offences alleged by the prosecution. So far as the statements of the eye witnesses namely (L.W.6) Muthalagu S/o Nallu and (L.W.8) Pandi S/o Karuppaiah are concerned, it has been stated that in the year of 2009 on the first day of May at about 10.00 hours the petitioners-accused along with the other accused came to quarries of Pallava Granite Company and PRP Granite Company situate in Sirumanickam, and trespassed into the Vaikkal puramboke land situate in S.F.No.66/11 of Keelavalavu Village adjoining Pallava Granite Quarry. So far as the specific overt act on the part of these petitioners-accused



is concerned, the eye witnesses would state as follows: &quot;Kannan was standing there showed the porambake site that this place is full of good stones. Palanichamy told we will take care and looked at his daughter Sivaranjani and asked shall we start the work tomorrow? And she said we will start today itself after worshipping God. Chandralekha and Palanichamy's wife Selvi told that Sivaranjani statement is correct.&quot; So far as the statements of the eye witnesses namely (L.W.7) Thangaraj S/o. Veeranan Ambalam and (L.W. 9) Mayalagu S/o. Alagan are concerned they would attribute the following overt act as Follows: &quot;Then Gandhi and Thavaselvam brought explosive substance Ganesan took from them the same and filled the holes. Subba Reddy, Shilaja Reddy, Palanichamy, Selvi, Senthil Kumar, Suresh Kumar, Maharajan, Arumugam, Shanmuganathan, Pugalenth, Paramasivam and Subbiah instigated Genesan to blast the site quickly.&quot; As per the above statement of the witnesses (L.W.6) Muthalagu and (L.W.8) Pandi the overt act doesn't connect these three petitioners-accused with the offence. The Petitioner-accused Sivaranjani was asked by her father as to when the quarry work could be started It needs to be noted that she would say that work could be started immediately. It also needs to be noted that her father Palanichamy has got legal quarrying mines also. Under the circumstances these petitioners stating that the work could be started today itself without being connected to the illegal quarrying doesn't appear to make out an offence against them. The above said overt act of giving and opinion to start the work alone without involving themselves in the illegal quarrying of granite stones in the puramboke land will not make out on offence. As already held by this court only if an allegation when proved will lead to conviction the petitioners-accused need to be put to trail. It needs to be further pointed out at this juncture that as per the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in AIR 1979 SC



WEB COPY



*Crl.R.C(MD)No.1060 of 2025*

366-Union of India Vs Prafulla kumar samal and others it has been held that “3.By and large however if two views are equally possible and the judge is satisfied that the evidence produced before him while giving rise to some suspicion but not grave suspicion against the accused, he will be fully with in his right to discharge the accused.” Since the averments doesn't make out the offence even if proved against them this court is of the considered view that they have to be discharged from this case . However so far as the other two eye witnesses namely (L.W.7) Thangaraj and (L.W.9) Mayalagu concerned, they would state the petitioners-accused Selvi would direct Ganesan to explode the granite stones using explosives which statements of the witnesses bring petitioner- accused Selvi alone within the ambit of committing an offence along with the other accused. Therefore this court is of the considered view that when the petition in Cr.M.P.No.2353/2022 in Spl.S.C.No. 39/2021 deserves admittance so far as the 2nd petitioner-accused Sivaranjani and the 3rd petitioner-accused Chandralekha are concerned, the petition has to be dismissed so far as the 1st petitioner accused Selvi is concerned.”

17. After perusal of the order passed by the learned Trial Court, this Court finds that the learned Trial Court has given a reasonable findings that no overt act was committed by the Respondents 2 and 3/ Sivaranjani/A12 & Chandralekha/A13. The above said overt act of the Respondents 2 and 3/ Sivaranjani/A12 & Chandralekha/A13 giving an opinion to start the work alone without involving herself in the illegal



*Crl.R.C(MD)No.1060 of 2025*

quarrying of granite stones in poromboke lands will not make out an offence.

18. Considering all the material on record and the Statements of witnesses, the learned Trial Court rightly by the common order dated 27.03.2023 discharged the Respondents 2 and 3/ Sivaranjani/A12 & Chandralekha/A13 from the alleged offence.

19. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Sajjan Kumar Vs Central Bureau of Investigation*** reported in ***(2010) 9 SCC 368*** was pleased to lay down the following principles governing discharge and framing of charges:

*“17) Exercise of jurisdiction under Sections 227 & 228 of Cr.P.C.*

*On consideration of the authorities about the scope of Section 227 and 228 of the Code, the following principles emerge:-*



WEB COPY



*CrI.R.C(MD)No.1060 of 2025*

*(i) The Judge while considering the question of framing the charges under Section 227 of the Cr.P.C. has the undoubted power to sift and weigh the evidence for the limited purpose of finding out whether or not a prima facie case against the accused has been made out. The test to determine prima facie case would depend upon the facts of each case.*

*ii) Where the materials placed before the Court disclose grave suspicion against the accused which has not been properly explained, the Court will be fully justified in framing a charge and proceeding with the trial.*

*iii) The Court cannot act merely as a Post Office or a mouthpiece of the prosecution but has to consider the broad probabilities of the case, the total effect of the evidence and the documents produced before the Court, any basic infirmities etc. However, at this stage, there cannot be a roving enquiry into the pros and cons of the*



*matter and weigh the evidence as if he was conducting a trial.*

*iv) If on the basis of the material on record, the Court could form an opinion that the accused might have committed offence, it can frame the charge, though for conviction the conclusion is required to be proved beyond reasonable doubt that the accused has committed the offence.*

*v) At the time of framing of the charges, the probative value of the material on record cannot be gone into but before framing a charge the Court must apply its judicial mind on the material placed on record and must be satisfied that the commission of offence by the accused was possible.*

*vi) At the stage of Sections 227 and 228, the Court is required to evaluate the material and documents on record with a view to find out if the facts emerging*



*Crl.R.C(MD)No.1060 of 2025*

*therefrom taken at their face value discloses the existence of all the ingredients constituting the alleged offence. For this limited purpose, sift the evidence as it cannot be expected even at that initial stage to accept all that the prosecution states as gospel truth even if it is opposed to common sense or the broad probabilities of the case.*

*vii) If two views are possible and one of them gives rise to suspicion only, as distinguished from grave suspicion, the trial Judge will be empowered to discharge the accused and at this stage, he is not to see whether the trial will end in conviction or acquittal.”*

**20. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of *Union of India vs. Prafulla Kumar Samal* reported in *AIR 1979 SC 366* has held as under:-**

*"(1) That the Judge while considering the question of framing the charges under Section 227 of*



*the Code has the undoubted power to sift and weigh the evidence for the limited purpose of finding out whether or not a prima facie case against the accused has been made out.*

*(2) Where the materials placed before the Court disclose grave suspicion against the accused which has not been properly explained the Court will be fully justified in framing a charge and proceeding with the trial.*

*(3) The test to determine a prima facie case would naturally depend upon the facts of each case and it is difficult to lay down a rule of universal application. **By and large however if two views are equally possible and the Judge is satisfied that the evidence produced before him while giving rise to some suspicion but not grave suspicion against the accused, he will be fully within his right to discharge the accused.***

21. Even considering the principle of vicarious liability as argued by the learned Government Advocate for the Revision Petitioner/State, the further question that arises for consideration before this Court in the



*Crl.R.C(MD)No.1060 of 2025*

present case is whether the Respondents 2 and 3/ Sivaranjani/A12 & Chandralekha/A13, can be held liable for the offence, even if the allegations in the complaint are taken on their face value to be correct in entirety. Vicarious criminal liability of its Directors, Partners and Shareholders would arise provided any provision exists in that behalf in the statute. The Statute must contain provision fixing such a vicarious liability. Even for the said purpose, it would be obligatory on the part of the complainant and the investigating agency to make requisite allegations and collect evidence in support thereof which would attract provisions constituting vicarious liability and in the case of the Respondents 2 and 3/ Sivaranjani/A12 & Chandralekha/A13, no such material was available with the prosecution to establish and attract provisions constituting the vicarious liability.

22. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Sunil Bharti Mittal v. CBI***, reported in ***(2015) 4 SCC 609*** while dealing with the issue of vicarious liability of the Officers, Directors, Managing Directors,



Crl.R.C(MD)No.1060 of 2025

Chairman of the Company was pleased to observe in paras- 42 to 44 and 48 to 50 of the aforesaid judgment, which read as under:-

*"42. No doubt, a corporate entity is an artificial person which acts through its officers, Directors, Managing Director, Chairman, etc. If such a company commits an offence involving mens rea, it would normally be the intent and action of that individual who would act on behalf of the company. It would be more so, when the criminal act is that of conspiracy. However, at the same time, it is the cardinal principle of criminal jurisprudence that there is no vicarious liability unless the statute specifically provides so.*

*43. Thus, an individual who has perpetrated the commission of an offence on behalf of a company can be made an accused, along with the company, if there is sufficient evidence of his active role coupled with criminal intent. Second situation in which he can be implicated is in those cases where the statutory regime itself attracts the doctrine of vicarious liability, by specifically incorporating such a provision.*



44. *When the company is the offender, vicarious liability of the Directors cannot be imputed automatically, in the absence of any statutory provision to this effect. One such example is Section 141 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881. In Aneeta Hada [Aneeta Hada v. Godfather Travels & Tours (P) Ltd., (2012) 5 SCC 661 : (2012) 3 SCC (Civ) 350 : (2012) 3 SCC (Cri) 241] , the Court noted that if a group of persons that guide the business of the company have the criminal intent, that would be imputed to the body corporate and it is in this backdrop, Section 141 of the Negotiable Instruments Act has to be understood. Such a position is, therefore, because of statutory intendment making it a deeming fiction. Here also, the principle of "alter ego", was applied only in one direction, namely, where a group of persons that guide the business had criminal intent, that is to be imputed to the body corporate and not the vice versa. Otherwise, there has to be a specific act attributed to the Director or any other person allegedly in control and management of the company, to the effect that such a person was*



*responsible for the acts committed by or on behalf of the company."*

*48. Sine qua non for taking cognizance of the offence is the application of mind by the Magistrate and his satisfaction that the allegations, if proved, would constitute an offence. It is, therefore, imperative that on a complaint or on a police report, the Magistrate is bound to consider the question as to whether the same discloses commission of an offence and is required to form such an opinion in this respect. When he does so and decides to issue process, he shall be said to have taken cognizance. At the stage of taking cognizance, the only consideration before the court remains to consider judiciously whether the material on which the prosecution proposes to prosecute the accused brings out a prima facie case or not.*

*49. Cognizance of an offence and prosecution of an offender are two different things. Section 190 of the Code empowered taking cognizance of an offence and not to deal with offenders. Therefore, cognizance can be taken even if offender is not known or named when*



*the complaint is filed or FIR registered. Their names may transpire during investigation or afterwards.*

*50. Person who has not joined as accused in the charge-sheet can be summoned at the stage of taking cognizance under Section 190 of the Code. There is no question of applicability of Section 319 of the Code at this stage (see SWIL Ltd. v. State of Delhi [(2001) 6 SCC 670 : 2001 SCC (Cri) 1205] ). It is also trite that even if a person is not named as an accused by the police in the final report submitted, the court would be justified in taking cognizance of the offence and to summon the accused if it feels that the evidence and material collected during investigation justifies prosecution of the accused (see Union of India v. Prakash P. Hinduja [(2003) 6 SCC 195 : 2003 SCC (Cri) 1314] ). Thus, the Magistrate is empowered to issue process against some other person, who has not been charge-sheeted, but there has to be sufficient material in the police report showing his involvement. In that case, the Magistrate is empowered to ignore the conclusion arrived at by the investigating officer and apply his mind independently on the facts*



*emerging from the investigation and take cognizance of the case. At the same time, it is not permissible at this stage to consider any material other than that collected by the investigating officer."*

23. The Hon'ble Supreme Court also in the case of ***Shiv Kumar Jatia Vs. State of NCT of Delhi*** reported in ***(2019) 17 SCC 193*** while dealing with vicarious liability of Managing Director of the Company was pleased to observe in paras-21 and 22 as under:-

*"21. By applying the ratio laid down by this Court in Sunil Bharti Mittal [Sunil Bharti Mittal v. CBI, (2015) 4 SCC 609 : (2015) 2 SCC (Cri) 687] it is clear that an individual either as a Director or a Managing Director or Chairman of the company can be made an accused, along with the company, only if there is sufficient material to prove his active role coupled with the criminal intent. Further the criminal intent alleged must have direct nexus with the accused. Further in Maksud Saiyed v. State of Gujarat [Maksud Saiyed v. State of Gujarat, (2008) 5 SCC 668 : (2008)*



Crl.R.C(MD)No.1060 of 2025

2 SCC (Cri) 692] this Court has examined the vicarious liability of Directors for the charges levelled against the Company. In the aforesaid judgment this Court has held that, the Penal Code does not contain any provision for attaching vicarious liability on the part of the Managing Director or the Directors of the Company, when the accused is a company. It is held that vicarious liability of the Managing Director and Director would arise provided any provision exists in that behalf in the statute. It is further held that statutes indisputably must provide fixing such vicarious liability. It is also held that, even for the said purpose, it is obligatory on the part of the complainant to make requisite allegations which would attract the provisions constituting vicarious liability.

22. In the judgment of this Court in *Sharad Kumar Sanghi v. Sangita Rane* [*Sharad Kumar Sanghi v. Sangita Rane*, (2015) 12 SCC 781 : (2016) 1 SCC (Cri) 159] while examining the allegations made against the Managing Director of a Company, in which, company was not made a party, this Court has held that when the allegations made against the Managing Director are vague in nature, same can be



*the ground for quashing the proceedings under Section 482 CrPC. In the case on hand principally the allegations are made against the first accused company which runs Hotel Hyatt Regency. At the same time, the Managing Director of such company who is Accused 2 is a party by making vague allegations that he was attending all the meetings of the company and various decisions were being taken under his signatures. Applying the ratio laid down in the aforesaid cases, it is clear that principally the allegations are made only against the company and other staff members who are incharge of day-to-day affairs of the company. In the absence of specific allegations against the Managing Director of the company and having regard to nature of allegations made which are vague in nature, we are of the view that it is a fit case for quashing the proceedings, so far as the Managing Director is concerned."*

24. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Sham Sunder and Others Vs. State of Haryana [(1989) 4 SCC 630]*** laid emphasis on paragraphs 9 and 10, which are extracted hereunder :



*“9. But we are concerned with a criminal liability under penal provision and not a civil liability. The penal provision must be strictly construed in the first place. Secondly, there is no vicarious liability in criminal law unless the statute takes that also within its fold. Section 10 does not provide for such liability. It does not make all the partners liable for the offence whether they do business or not.*

*10. It is, therefore, necessary to add an emphatic note of caution in this regard. More often it is common that some of the partners of a firm may not even be knowing of what is going on day to day in the firm. There may be partners, better known as sleeping partners who are not required to take part in the business of the firm. There may be ladies and minors who were admitted for the benefit of partnership. They may not know anything about the business of the firm. It would be a travesty of justice to prosecute all partners and ask them to prove under the proviso to sub-section (1) that the offence was committed without their knowledge. It is significant to note that the obligation for the accused to prove under the proviso that the offence took place without his knowledge or*



*that he exercised all due diligence to prevent such offence arises only when the prosecution establishes that the requisite condition mentioned in sub-section (1) is established. The requisite condition is that the partner was responsible for carrying on the business and was during the relevant time in charge of the business. In the absence of any such proof, no partner could be convicted. We, therefore, reject the contention urged by counsel for the State.”*

25. Thus, the initiation of criminal proceedings against the Respondents 2 and 3/ Sivaranjani/A12 & Chandralekha/A13 lacks any substantive basis, as the Respondents 2 and 3/ Sivaranjani/A12 & Chandralekha/A13 have no direct control over the alleged matter. Therefore, the impugned proceedings initiated by the prosecution against the Respondents 2 and 3/ Sivaranjani/A12 & Chandralekha/A13 amount to an abuse of the process of law, and the Trial Court has rightly passed the impugned common order dated 27.03.2023 discharging the



*Crl.R.C(MD)No.1060 of 2025*

Respondents 2 and 3/ Sivaranjani/A12 & Chandralekha/A13 from the present case.

26. This Court is also of the view that the Respondents 2 and 3/ Sivaranjani/A12 & Chandralekha/A13 was summoned by the Trial Court on the basis of the final report to face the trial, was also on the erroneous consideration as the summoning of the accused in a criminal case is a serious matter.

27. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Pepsi Foods Ltd. v. Judicial Magistrate*** reported in ***(1998) 5 SCC 749*** has been pleased to observe in paragraph No.28, which is reproduced hereinunder:-

*"28. Summoning of an accused in a criminal case is a serious matter. Criminal law cannot be set into motion as a matter of course. It is not that the complainant has to bring only two witnesses to support his allegations in the complaint to have the criminal law set into motion. The order of the Magistrate summoning the*



*accused must reflect that he has applied his mind to the facts of the case and the law applicable thereto. He has to examine the nature of allegations made in the complaint and the evidence both oral and documentary in support thereof and would that be sufficient for the complainant to succeed in bringing charge home to the accused. It is not that the Magistrate is a silent spectator at the time of recording of preliminary evidence before summoning of the accused. The Magistrate has to carefully scrutinise the evidence brought on record and may even himself put questions to the complainant and his witnesses to elicit answers to find out the truthfulness of the allegations or otherwise and then examine if any offence is prima facie committed by all or any of the accused."*

28. Further the Hon'ble Supreme Court has also laid down the guidelines where the criminal proceedings could be interfered and quashed in exercise of its power by the High Court in the following cases:- **(i) R.P. Kapoor Vs. State of Punjab, AIR 1960 S.C. 866, (ii) State of Bihar Vs. P.P. Sharma, 1992 SCC (Crl.)192, (iii) Zandu Pharmaceutical Works Ltd. Vs. Mohd. Saraful Haq and another,**



*Crl.R.C(MD)No.1060 of 2025*

***(Para-10) 2005 SCC (Cri.) 283 and (iv) Neeharika Infrastructure Pvt.***

***Ltd. Vs. State of Maharashtra, AIR 2021 SC 1918.***

29. Thus, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and in the light of the observations and discussions made above and keeping in view of the fact and circumstances of the case and from perusal of the common order dated 27.03.2023 made in Crl.M.P.No. 2353 of 2022 in Spl.S.C.No.39 of 2021 on the file of the learned Special Court to Deal with the Cases of Offences in Contravention of the Provisions of the Mines & Minerals (D&R) Act, Madurai, is a reasoned and speaking order and rightly discharged the Respondents 2 and 3/ Sivaranjani/A12 & Chandralekha/A13 from the alleged offence, do not require any interference by this Court. The present Criminal Revision is liable to be dismissed.

30. Accordingly, for the reasons discussions above, the instant Criminal Revision Petition filed by the Revision Petitioner/State stands



*Crl.R.C(MD)No.1060 of 2025*

**dismissed** and the common order passed by the Trial Court, dated 27.03.2023 made in Crl.M.P.No.2353 of 2022 in Spl.S.C.No.39 of 2021 on the file of the learned Special Court to Deal with the Cases of Offences in Contravention of the Provisions of the Mines & Minerals (D&R) Act, Madurai, in respect of discharging the Respondents 2 and 3/ Sivaranjani/A12 & Chandralekha/A13 from the alleged offence, is hereby **confirmed**. There is no order as to costs. File is consigned to record.

Index :Yes / No  
Internet :Yes / No  
NCC :Yes / No  
Nsr

**20.11.2025**

To:

- 1.The Principal Special Court for Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act Cases, Madurai.
- 2.The Additional Public Prosecutor,  
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,  
Madurai.



WEB COPY



*Crl.R.C(MD)No.1060 of 2025*

**SHAMIM AHMED, J.**

Nsr

Order made in  
Crl.R.C(MD)No.1060 of 2025

**20.11.2025**

37/37