



CRL OP No. 21065 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 21-04-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE G.K. ILANTHIRAIYAN

**CRL OP No. 21065 of 2023 &
Crl.M.P.No.14458 of 2023**

Elumalai
S/o. Mari Konar, No.97, Sri Ram Nagar,
Karambakkam Village, Maduravayal Taluk,
Chennai.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. State Rep.By
Inspector Of Police,
Valasaravakkam Police Station,
Chennai District. Cr.No.72 Of 2022.
2. Ezhilarasi
W/o. Venkatraman, No.97, Sri Ram Nagar,
Karambakkam Village, Maduravayal Taluk,
Chennai.

..Respondent(s)

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C., to call for the records and quash the FIR in Cr.No.72 of 2022 on the file of the respondent police and thus render justice.

For Petitioner(s): Mr. P.Singaram

For Respondent(s): Mr.A.Gopinath for R1
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)
Mr.V.Murugesan for R2



CRL OP No. 21065 of 2023

ORDER

WEB COPY

This petition has been filed to quash the F.I.R. in Crime No.72 of 2022 registered by the first respondent police for alleged offences under Sections 294(b) 354 and 506(1) of IPC, as against the petitioner.

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 04.05.2022, the defacto complainant preferred a complaint against the petitioner indicating that the petitioner, who is the brother of her husband, after demise of her father-in-law, abused the defacto complainant by showing private parts and threatened her with dire consequences.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the property in which the defacto complainant is residing, belongs to the petitioner also, in fact, the petitioner's father-in-law is the absolute owner of the property, however, the 2nd respondent is attempting to grab the property, when the same was questioned, the defacto complainant lodged a false complaint. Hence he prayed to quash the same.



4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the 1st respondent would submit that the investigation is almost completed and the respondent police have to file a final report.

5. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) and the learned counsel appearing for the 2nd respondent and perused the materials placed on record.

6. It is seen from the First Information Report that there are specific allegations as against the petitioner to attract the offence, which has to be investigated in depth. Further, even on the date of occurrence, i.e., on 30.03.2022, the 2nd respondent lodged a complaint through Helpline, 100, however, no action has been taken against the petitioner, finally, only on 06.05.2022, the 1st respondent has registered FIR as against the accused. The FIR is not an encyclopedia and it need not contain all facts and it cannot be quashed in the threshold. This Court finds that the FIR discloses prima facie commission of cognizable offence and as such, this Court cannot interfere with the investigation.



The investigating machinery has to step in to investigate, grab and unearth the crime in accordance with the procedures prescribed in the Code. That apart, there are specific allegations as against the petitioner to attract the offences under Sections 294(b), 354 and 506(1) of IPC.

7. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the judgment reported in **2019 (14) SCC 350** in the case of **Sau. Kamal Shivaji Pokarnekar vs. The State of Maharashtra & ors., (Crl.A.No.255 of 2019** dated **12.02.2019**) held that the learned Magistrate while taking cognizance and summoning, is required to apply his judicial mind only with the view to taking cognizance of the offence whether a *prima facie* case has been made out for summoning the accused person. The learned Magistrate is not required to evaluate the merits of the materials or evidence in support of the complaint, because the Magistrate must not undertake the exercise to find out whether the materials would lead to conviction or not. Only in a case where the complaint does not disclose any offence or is frivolous, vexatious or oppressive, the complaint/FIR can be taken for consideration for quashment. If the allegations set out in the complaint do not constitute the offence of which cognizance has been taken by



Magistrate, it can be considered for quashment. Therefore, it is not necessary that a meticulous analysis of the case should be done before the trial to find out whether the case would end in conviction or acquittal. If it appears on a reading of the complaint and consideration of the allegations therein, in the light of the statement made on oath that the ingredients of the offence are disclosed, there would be no justification to interfere. At the initial stage of issuance of process, it is no open to the Court to stifle the proceedings by entering into the merits of the contentions made on behalf of the accused. Therefore, the criminal complaint cannot be quashed only on the ground that the allegations made therein appear to be of a civil nature. If the ingredients of the offence alleged against the accused are *prima facie* made out in the complaint, the criminal proceeding shall not be interdicted.

8. Further, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India issued directions in the judgment reported in **2021 SCC Online SC 315** in the case of ***M/s.Neeharika Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd., Vs. State of Maharashtra & ors.***, as follows :-

“23.

vi) *Criminal proceedings ought not to be scuttled at*



WEB COPY

the initial stage;

vii) Quashing of a complaint/FIR should be an exception rather than an ordinary rule;

.....

xii) The first information report is not an encyclopaedia which must disclose all facts and details relating to the offence reported. Therefore, when the investigation by the police is in progress, the court should not go into the merits of the allegations in the FIR. Police must be permitted to complete the investigation. It would be premature to pronounce the conclusion based on hazy facts that the complaint/FIR does not deserve to be investigated or that it amounts to abuse of process of law. After investigation, if the investigating officer finds that there is no substance in the application made by the complainant, the investigating officer may file an appropriate report/summary before the learned Magistrate which may be considered by the learned Magistrate in accordance with the known procedure;

.....

xv) When a prayer for quashing the FIR is made by the alleged accused and the court when it exercises the power under Section 482 Cr.P.C., only has to consider whether the allegations in the FIR disclose commission of a cognizable offence or not. The court is not required to consider on merits whether or not the merits of the



CRL OP No. 21065 of 2023

WEB COPY

allegations make out a cognizable offence and the court has to permit the investigating agency/police to investigate the allegations in the FIR;

9. In view of the above discussions, this Court is not inclined to quash the First Information Report. However, considering the crime is of the year 2022, the first respondent is directed to complete the investigation in Crime No.72 of 2022 and file a final report within a period of twelve weeks from the date of receipt of copy of this Order, before the jurisdiction Magistrate, if not already filed.

10. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

21-04-2026

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

ssd
To

State Rep.By
Inspector Of Police, Valasaravakkam Police Station,
Chennai District.



WEB COPY



CRL OP No. 21065 of 2023

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN, J.

ssd

CRL OP No. 21065 of 2023

21-04-2026

1.