Order QR

WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 27-10-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE G.K. ILANTHIRAIYAN

CRL OP No. 31056 of 2026
and Crl.M.P.No.20492 of 2026

CNR: {HCMA012409212026}

1. N. Thamarai Kannan
   S/o Nagarajan,
   No.F2, Sri Bama Flat,
   No.25, Rama Chandra Nagar,
   2nd Main Road,
   Kerugambakkam,
   Chennai.
2. Padmavathy
   W/o Nagarajan,
   No.F2, Sri Bama Flat,
   No.25, Rama Chandra Nagar,
   2nd Main Road,
   Kerugambakkam,
   Chennai.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. State Represented By, The Inspector of Police
   T-2, Chrompet Police Station,
   Chennai.
   In Cr.No.164 of 2026
2. Saranya
   W/o N. Thamarai Kannan,
   No.F2, Sai Krishna Apartments,
   Flat NO. 42, Door No.2/29,
   5th Main Road, New Colony,
   Chrompet,
   Chennai.

..Respondent(s)

Prayer: This petition is filed under section 528 of BNSS to call for the records culminated in the Impugned FIR in Cr.No.164 of 2026 dated 9-7-

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

WEB COPY

2026 on the file of the 1st respondent police and quash the same, and thus render justice.

For Petitioner(s): Mr. G.Anand Kumar

For Respondent(s): Mr.R.Ganesh Kumar,
Additional Public Prosecutor for R1

ORDER

This petition has been filed to quash the F.I.R. in Crime No.164 of 2026 registered by the first respondent police for offences under Sections 296 (b), 115(2), 351(2) of BNSS, 2023 as against the petitioner.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the first petitioner is the husband and the defacto complainant is the wife. The second petitioner is the mother-in-law of the defacto complainant. It is alleged that the first petitioner abused the defacto complainant in filthy language and also assaulted her in cheeks, due to which the defacto complainant sustained injuries. Hence, the defacto complainant lodged a complaint against the petitioner before the first respondent. On the complaint lodged by the defacto complainant, the first respondent registered a case against the petitioners in Crime No.164 of 2026 for the offence under sections 296(b), 115(2) and 351(2) of the BNSS, 2023. To quash the same the petitioners have filed the present Criminal Original Petition.

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

WEB COPY

3. The learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is an innocent person and they have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. Without any base, the first respondent police registered a case in Crime No.164 of 2026 as against the petitioner. Hence he prayed to quash the same.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor would submit that the investigation is almost completed and the respondent police have only to file final report.

5. Heard the learned Counsel appearing on either side 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 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.

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

WEB COPY

7. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in it's 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 not 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

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

WEB COPY

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 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;*
>
> *.....*

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

WEB COPY

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 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 in Cr.No.164 of 2026 on the file of the first respondent. Accordingly, the Criminal Original Petition stand dismissed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is also closed.

27-10-2026

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

SMN
To.
The Inspector of Police
T-2, Chrompet Police Station,
Chennai.
2. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras

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

WEB COPY

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN, J.

SMN

CRL OP No. 31056 of 2026
and Crl.M.P.No.20492 of 2026

27-10-2026

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