WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

**DATED: 28-10-2026**

CORAM

**THE HON'BLE MRS.JUSTICE S.ALLI**

**CRL OP No. 2333 of 2024**
**and**
**Crl MP Nos.1683 & 1685 of 2024**

*CNR: {HCMA010102492024}*

Veera Jagadeesan,
S/o.Samuel Pandian,
No.9, Ayappa Street,
Saraswathi Home,
Banunagar West,
Ambattur, Chennai.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The State of Tamil Nadu,
   Rep by Inspector of Police, Law and Order,
   S9, Palavanthangal, Police Station.

2. K.C.Bose,
   S/o.Korah,
   138C, 1st Main Road,
   Nanganallur, Chennai.

..Respondent(s)

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C., praying to call for the records pertaining to the charge sheet in C.C.No.513 of 2010 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Alandur, and quash the same.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.C.K.M.Appaji

For Respondent(s): Mrs.R.S.Indira,
Additional Public Prosecutor for R1

R2 - died



https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY



**ORDER**

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed seeking to quash the charge sheet in C.C.No.513 of 2010 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Alandur, insofar as the petitioner/A2 is concerned.

2.The case of the prosecution is that, there was a business dispute between the first accused, V.Vidya, and the second respondent/de facto complainant, K.C.Bose, who was engaged in the real estate business. On 10.06.2009, at about 10.00 a.m., the first accused, along with the petitioner/A2 and the third accused, Nagauman, came in a car bearing Registration No.TN-02-E-9191. It is alleged that A3 remained in the car, while A1 and the petitioner/A2 entered the house of the de facto complainant, abused him in filthy language and threatened him.

3.It is further alleged that, on 30.07.2009, at about 9.00 a.m., A1 and the petitioner/A2 came to the house of the de facto complainant and demanded a sum of Rs.1 crore, threatening him and his family members. Further, on 13.08.2009, at about 12.55 p.m., A1 and A2 allegedly contacted the de facto complainant over phone, demanded a sum of Rs.1 crore and threatened to set fire to him and his family members. On 14.08.2009, at about 1.20 p.m., A1 allegedly again demanded money from the de facto complainant while travelling in a bus.



https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

4.Based on the complaint lodged by the second respondent, a case was registered in Crime No.310 of 2009 on the file of the first respondent police for the offences under Sections 448, 341, 385 and 506(ii) of the Indian Penal Code, 1860. After the completion of investigation, the first respondent police filed a final report, which was taken on file in C.C.No.513 of 2010 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Alandur, for the offences under Sections 448, 341, 294(b), 387, 201 and 506(ii) read with Section 34 IPC.

5.The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that there are totally three accused in this case, out of whom the proceedings against A1 have already been quashed by this Court in Crl.O.P.No.32074 of 2019, by order dated 22.09.2023. A3 has also died. The de facto complainant/R2 also passed away. The present petitioner is the Accused No.2.

6.The learned counsel would further submit that there is absolutely no sufficient material against the petitioner/A2 and that the allegation against him is that he accompanied A1 and A3 in a car at the time of the alleged commission of the offences. The learned counsel would submit that, in the absence of sufficient material against the petitioner, the continuation of the criminal proceedings against him would amount to an abuse of the process of law. Hence, the learned counsel would pray that the proceedings against the petitioner/A2 may be quashed.


https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

7.The learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the first respondent police would submit that there are allegations against the petitioner in the FIR and the final report. However, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor would further submit that the proceedings against A1 have already been quashed by this Court, A3 has died and there are no sufficient materials against the petitioner/A2. Hence, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor would submit that the Criminal Original Petition may be allowed.

8.This Court has carefully considered the rival submissions made on either side and perused the materials available on record.

9.On perusal of the FIR and the final report, it is seen that allegations have been made against the petitioner/A2 along with the other accused in connection with the alleged incidents. The specific role attributed to the petitioner and the materials available on record have to be considered in the light of the subsequent developments in the case.

10.Considering the fact that the proceedings against the main accused/A1 have already been quashed by this Court and that A3 and the de facto complainant/R2 have also died, and further considering that there are no sufficient materials against the petitioner/A2, this Court is of the view that permitting the criminal proceedings to continue against the petitioner would



https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

amount to an abuse of the process of law. Therefore, this Court is inclined to quash the criminal proceedings against the petitioner/A2 in the interest of justice.

11.Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is allowed and the proceedings in C.C.No.513 of 2010 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Alandur, are quashed insofar as the petitioner/A2 is concerned. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

**28-10-2026**

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Neutral Citation: Yes/No

CDA

To

1.The Judicial Magistrate, Alandur.

2.The Inspector of Police, Law and Order,
S9, Palavanthangal, Police Station.

3.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY



**S.ALLI, J.**

CDA

**CRL OP No. 2333 of 2024**

**28-10-2026**



https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis