WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 11-11-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE G.K. ILANTHIRAIYAN

CRL OP No. 32507 of 2026

CNR:{HCMA012672902026}

Case QR

AND

CRL MP NO. 21364 OF 2026

1. Vinoth
   S/o Gnanasekaran,
   Mettupalayam,
   Coimbatore.

2. Maheshkumar
   S/o Kuppusamy,
   No.7/9, Pillaiyar Kovil Street,
   VTC. Nambiyur Post,
   Erode.

3. Shanmugam
   S/o Marappan,
   Om Sakthi Nagar,
   Police Quarters Road,
   Coimbatore.

4. Prithvi Raj
   S/o Shanmugam,
   Om Sakthi Nagar,
   Police Quarters Road,
   Coimbatore.

5. Aishwarya
   W/o Prithvi Raj,
   Residing at,
   No.19,
   Om Sakthi Nagar,
   Police Quarters Road,
   Coimbatore.

..Petitioner(s)

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

WEB COPY

Vs

1. The State represented by,
   The Inspector of Police
   District Crime Branch,
   Coimbatore.
   Crime No.08 of 2026

2. Gaurava Garwal
   S/o.Shaitan Mal Agarwal,
   Indore, Madhyapradesh.

..Respondent(s)

Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to call for the records of the FIR in Crime No.8 of 2026 dated 27.05.2026 on the file of the first respondent police and quash the same as against the petitioners herein.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.S.Udayakumar

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

ORDER

This criminal original petition has been filed to quash the FIR in Crime No.8 of 2026 dated 27.05.2026 on the file of the first respondent police, as against the petitioners.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the second respondent/*de facto* complainant is an intermediator for cotton suppliers and purchasers; in the

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

WEB COPY

month of March 2024, the first petitioner (A1) approached the *de facto* complainant and informed that he (A1) and the second petitioner (A2) are the Directors of the company *viz*. Sri Sai Textiles Private Limited and they are involving in the business of textile mill and requested to arrange cotton supplies on credit basis through three supplier companies *viz*. Advaita Exports Private Limited, Maharudra Industries, Raghav Commodities between 28.03.2024 and 16.06.2025; while that being so, after the supply of cotton, the accused 3 to 5 colluded with A1 and A2 and failed to pay the outstanding amount of Rs.1,92,81,306/- to the said company and diverted the supplied cotton to the other company *viz*. Marappar Textiles. Hence, the complaint.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioners are innocent persons 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.8 of 2026 for the offences under Sections 61(2), 316(5) and 318(4) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, as against the petitioners. Hence he prayed to quash the same.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the first respondent submitted that the investigation is almost completed and the first respondent police have only to file final report.

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

WEB COPY

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 petitioners to attract the offences, 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.

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

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

WEB COPY

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 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;*

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

WEB COPY

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

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

WEB COPY

9. In view of the above discussions, this Court is not inclined to quash the First Information Report. However, the first respondent is directed to complete the investigation in Crime No.8 of 2026 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.

Accordingly, the criminal original petition stands dismissed. Connected Crl.M.P. is closed.

11-11-2026

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

nsd

To

1. The Inspector of Police
   District Crime Branch,
   Coimbatore.

2. The Public Prosecutor,
   High Court, Madras.

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

WEB COPY

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN J.

nsd

CRL OP No. 32507 of 2026

11-11-2026

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