

G.Thirumurugan Vs. State Through The

G.Thirumurugan Vs. State Through The

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/49537

Court : Chennai

Decided On : Mar-16-2015

Judge : C.T. Selvam

Appellant : G.Thirumurugan

Respondent : State Through The

Judgement :

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT DATED:

16. 03.2015 CORAM THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE C.T. SELVAM
CRL.O.P.(MD) Nos.4326 of 2015 4328, 4330, 4345, 4361, 4386, 4397, 4407,
4418, 4461, 4478, 4505, 4510, 4517, 4520, 4522, 4524, 4525, 4527, 4531, 4537,
4540, 4541, 4542, 4543, 4623 4546, 4547, 4548, 4549, 4550, 4554, 4555, 4559,
4560, 4562, 4568, 4571, 4584, 4588, 4600, 4610, 4616, 4619, 4620, 4621, 4622,
423, 4624, 4625, 4628, 4629, 4632, 4640, 4642, 4656, 4665, 4672, 4679, 4680,
4681, 4682, 4683, 4685, 4686, 4688, 4693, 4694 and 4698 of 2015 Petitioner in
Crl.O.P.(MD) No.4326 of 2015 G.Thirumurugan .. Petitioner Vs. State through the
Inspector of Police, (Crimes) Tallakulam Police Station, Madurai City ..
Respondent Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. praying to
direct the respondent to register an FIR for offence under Section 420 IPC on the
basis of his complaint dated 27.02.2015 sent to the Commissioner of Police and
pending before the respondent. !For Petitioner : Mr.P.Jeyaram For Respondent :
Mr.K.Anbarasan Government Advocate,(Crl. Side) ***** :COMMON

ORDER

For the past two and a half months, this Court has been passing the following orders on petitions seeking registration of complaint: ?.By way of an interim order, this Court directs respondent police to peruse the complaint preferred by petitioner herein and register a case if the same informs commission of cognizable offence. In particular instances, respondent police may resort to a petition enquiry which again shall not extend beyond a period of one week. This order is made towards effecting and ensuring compliance with the decision of the Apex Court in *Lalita Kumari vs. Govt. of U.P. & others* [2013 (4) Crimes 243 (SC)].. It is expected that respondent police will follow the dictate of the Apex Court in the aforesaid judgment in letter and spirit and not give room for any further action at the hands of this Court. In the event of respondent police not being in receipt of complaint allegedly preferred before them by petitioner, it would always be open for respondent police to inform such position at the next hearing date. Post after two weeks.?. Despite the same, we note that generally, action of the respondents have been more in the breach than in observance.

2. The matter is one of grave concern. Despite the decision of the Apex Court in *Lalita Kumari vs. Govt. of U.P.& Others* (2013 (4) Crimes 243 (SC)) and despite the repeated direction of this Court requiring action of respondent police, the respondent police ever so often, are found to conduct themselves with gay abandon.

3. This Court, therefore, directs the respondents to strictly follow the mandate in *Lalita Kumari vs. Govt. of U.P.& Others* (2013

(4) Crimes 243 (SC)) and register cases without fail, where reading of the complaint informs cognizable offences. Their failure to do so would be actionable in contempt at the hands of the respective petitioners. Respondent Police may also note that if their resorting to conduct of petition enquiry, is seen as a ruse to avoid the registration of a case, the same would be actionable in contempt. We would also add a word in caution that the decision of the Apex Court in *Arnesh Kumar vs. State of Bihar* and Another reported in (2014) 3 MLJ (CrI) (SC) scrupulously is to be followed. Such decision in paragraph Nos.9, 14 and 15,

inform thus: "9. From a plain reading of the aforesaid provision, it is evident that a person accused of offence punishable with imprisonment for a term which may be less than seven years or which may extend to seven years with or without fine, cannot be arrested by the police officer only on its satisfaction that such person had committed the offence punishable as aforesaid. Police officer before arrest, in such cases has to be further satisfied that such arrest is necessary to prevent such person from committing any further offence; or for proper investigation of the case; or to prevent the accused from causing the evidence of the offence to disappear; or tampering with such evidence in any manner; or to prevent such person from making any inducement, threat or promise to a witness so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or the police officer; or unless such accused person is arrested, his presence in the court whenever required cannot be ensured. These are the conclusions, which one may reach based on facts. Law mandates the police officer to state the facts and record the reasons in writing which led him to come to a conclusion covered by any of the provisions aforesaid, while making such arrest. Law further requires the police officers to record the reasons in writing for not making the arrest. In pith and core, the police officer before arrest must put a question to himself, why arrest?. Is it really required?. What purpose it will serve?. What object it will achieve?. It is only after these questions are addressed and one or the other conditions as enumerated above is satisfied, the power of arrest needs to be exercised. In fine, before arrest first the police officers should have reason to believe on the basis of information and material that the accused has committed the offence. Apart from this, the police officer has to be satisfied further that the arrest is necessary for one or the more purposes envisaged by sub-clauses (a) to (e) of clause

(1) of Section 41 of Cr.P.C. 14. Our endeavour in this judgment is to ensure that police officers do not arrest accused unnecessarily and Magistrate do not authorize detention casually and mechanically. In order to ensure what we have observed above, we give the following direction:

(1) All the State Governments to instruct its police officers not to automatically arrest when a case under Section 498-A of the IPC is registered but to satisfy themselves about the necessity for arrest under the parameters laid down above

flowing from Section 41, Cr.PC;

(2) All police officers be provided with a check list containing specified sub-clauses under Section 41(1)(b)(ii);

(3) The police officer shall forward the check list duly filed and furnish the reasons and materials which necessitated the arrest, while forwarding/producing the accused before the Magistrate for further detention;

(4) The Magistrate while authorising detention of the accused shall peruse the report furnished by the police officer in terms aforesaid and only after recording its satisfaction, the Magistrate will authorise detention;

(5) The decision not to arrest an accused, be forwarded to the Magistrate within two weeks from the date of the institution of the case with a copy to the Magistrate which may be extended by the Superintendent of police of the district for the reasons to be recorded in writing;

(6) Notice of appearance in terms of Section 41A of Cr.PC be served on the accused within two weeks from the date of institution of the case, which may be extended by the Superintendent of Police of the District for the reasons to be recorded in writing;

(7) Failure to comply with the directions aforesaid shall apart from rendering the police officers concerned liable for departmental action, they shall also be liable to be punished for contempt of court to be instituted before High Court having territorial jurisdiction.

(8) Authorising detention without recording reasons as aforesaid by the judicial Magistrate concerned shall be liable for departmental action by the appropriate High Court. 15. We hasten to add that the directions aforesaid shall not only apply to the cases under Section 498-A of the I.P.C. or Section 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, the case in hand, but also such cases where offence is punishable with imprisonment for a term which may be less than seven years or which may extend to seven years; whether with or without fine.

4. Of interest and concern to the FIRST POLICE OFFICER of the State, the Director General of Police, would be the following extract from the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in Lalita Kumari vs. Govt. of U.P. & Others (2013

(4) Crimes 243 (SC)): ¶.93) The Committee on Reforms of Criminal Justice System headed by Dr. Justice V.S. Malimath also noticed the plight faced by several people due to non-registration of FIRs and recommended that action should be taken against police officers who refuse to register such information. The Committee observed:- ¶.7.19.1 According to the Section 154 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the officer incharge of a police station is mandated to register every information oral or written relating to the commission of a cognizable offence. Non- registration of cases is a serious complaint against the police. The National Police Commission in its 4th report lamented that the police ¶.evade registering cases for taking up investigation where specific complaints are lodged at the police stations?.. It referred to a study conducted by the Indian Institute of Public Opinion, New Delhi regarding ¶.Image of the Police in India?. which observed that over 50% of the respondents mention non- registration of complaints as a common practice in police stations. 7.19.2 The Committee recommends that all complaints should be registered promptly, failing which appropriate action should be taken. This would necessitate change in the mind ¶. set of the political executive and that of senior officers. 7.19.4 There are two more aspects relating to registration. The first is minimization of offences by the police by way of not invoking appropriate sections of law. We disapprove of this tendency. Appropriate sections of law should be invoked in each case unmindful of the gravity of offences involved. The second issue is relating to the registration of written complaints. There is an increasing tendency amongst the police station officers to advise the informants, who come to give oral complaints, to bring written complaints. This is wrong. Registration is delayed resulting in valuable loss of time in launching the investigation and apprehension of criminals. Besides, the complainant gets an opportunity to consult his friends, relatives and sometimes even lawyers and often tends to exaggerate the crime and implicate innocent persons. This eventually has adverse effect at the trial. The information should be reduced in writing by the SH, if given orally, without any loss of time so that the first version of the alleged crime comes on record. 7.20.11 It has come to the

notice of the Committee that even in cognizable cases quite often the Police officers do not entertain the complaint and send the complainant away saying that the offence is not cognizable. Sometimes the police twist facts to bring the case within the cognizable category even though it is non-cognizable, due to political or other pressures or corruption. This menace can be stopped by making it obligatory on the police officer to register every complaint received by him. Breach of this duty should become an offence punishable in law to prevent misuse of the power by the police officer.?

94) It means that the number of FIRs not registered is approximately equivalent to the number of FIRs actually registered. Keeping in view the NCRB figures that show that about 60 lakh cognizable offences were registered in India during the year 2012, the burking of crime may itself be in the range of about 60 lakh every year. Thus, it is seen that such a large number of FIRs are not registered every year, which is a clear violation of the rights of the victims of such a large number of crimes.

95) Burking of crime leads to dilution of the rule of law in the short run; and also has a very negative impact on the rule of law in the long run since people stop having respect for rule of law. Thus, non-registration of such a large number of FIRs leads to a definite lawlessness in the society.

96) Therefore, reading Section 154 in any other form would not only be detrimental to the Scheme of the Code but also to the society as a whole. It is thus seen that this Court has repeatedly held in various decided cases that registration of FIR is mandatory if the information given to the police under Section 154 of the Code discloses the commission of a cognizable offence. Is there a likelihood of misuse of the provision?.

97) Another, stimulating argument raised in support of preliminary inquiry is that mandatory registration of FIRs will lead to arbitrary arrest, which will directly be in contravention of Article 21 of the Constitution.

98) While registration of FIR is mandatory, arrest of the accused immediately on registration of FIR is not at all mandatory. In fact, registration of FIR and arrest of

an accused person are two entirely different concepts under the law, and there are several safeguards available against arrest. Moreover, it is also pertinent to mention that an accused person also has a right to apply for anticipatory bail under the provisions of Section 438 of the Code if the conditions mentioned therein are satisfied. Thus, in appropriate cases, he can avoid the arrest under that provision by obtaining an order from the Court.

99) It is also relevant to note that in *Joginder Kumar vs. State of U.P. & Ors.* (1994) 4 SCC260 this Court has held that arrest cannot be made by police in a routine manner. Some important observations are reproduced as under:- No arrest can be made in a routine manner on a mere allegation of commission of an offence made against a person. It would be prudent for a police officer in the interest of protection of the constitutional rights of a citizen and perhaps in his own interest that no arrest should be made without a reasonable satisfaction reached after some investigation as to the genuineness and bona fides of a complaint and a reasonable belief both as to the person's complicity and even so as to the need to effect arrest. Denying a person of his liberty is a serious matter. The recommendations of the Police Commission merely reflect the constitutional concomitants of the fundamental right to personal liberty and freedom. A person is not liable to arrest merely on the suspicion of complicity in an offence. There must be some reasonable justification in the opinion of the officer effecting the arrest that such arrest is necessary and justified. Except in heinous offences, an arrest must be avoided if a police officer issues notice to person to attend the Station House and not to leave the Station without permission would do.

100) The registration of FIR under Section 154 of the Code and arrest of an accused person under Section 41 are two entirely different things. It is not correct to say that just because FIR is registered, the accused person can be arrested immediately. It is the imaginary fear that merely because FIR has been registered, it would require arrest of the accused and thereby leading to loss of his reputation and it should not be allowed by this Court to hold that registration of FIR is not mandatory to avoid such inconvenience to some persons. The remedy lies in strictly enforcing the safeguards available against arbitrary arrests made by the police and not in allowing the police to avoid mandatory registration of FIR

when the information discloses commission of a cognizable offence.

101) This can also be seen from the fact that Section 151 of the Code allows a police officer to arrest a person, even before the commission of a cognizable offence, in order to prevent the commission of that offence, if it cannot be prevented otherwise. Such preventive arrests can be valid for 24 hours. However, a Maharashtra State amendment to Section 151 allows the custody of a person in that State even for up to a period of 30 days (with the order of the Judicial Magistrate) even before a cognizable offence is committed in order to prevent commission of such offence. Thus, the arrest of a person and registration of FIR are not directly and/or irreversibly linked and they are entirely different concepts operating under entirely different parameters. On the other hand, if a police officer misuses his power of arrest, he can be tried and punished under Section

166.

102) Besides, the Code gives power to the police to close a matter both before and after investigation. A police officer can foreclose an FIR before an investigation under Section 157 of the Code, if it appears to him that there is no sufficient ground to investigate the same. The Section itself states that a police officer can start investigation when he has a ?reason to suspect the commission of an offence?.. Therefore, the requirements of launching an investigation under Section 157 of the Code are higher than the requirement under Section 154 of the Code. The police officer can also, in a given case, investigate the matter and then file a final report under Section 173 of the Code seeking closure of the matter. Therefore, the police is not liable to launch an investigation in every FIR which is mandatorily registered on receiving information relating to commission of a cognizable offence.

103) Likewise, giving power to the police to close an investigation, Section 157 of the Code also acts like a check on the police to make sure that it is dispensing its function of investigating cognizable offences. This has been recorded in the 41st Report of the Law Commission of India on the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898 as follows : ?14.1?..If the offence does not appear to be serious and if the station-house officer thinks there is no sufficient ground for starting an

investigation, he need not investigate but, here again, he has to send a report to the Magistrate who can direct the police to investigate, or if the Magistrate thinks fit, hold an inquiry himself. 14.2. A noticeable feature of the scheme as outlined above is that a Magistrate is kept in the picture at all stages of the police investigation, but he is not authorized to interfere with the actual investigation or to direct the police how that investigation is to be conducted. Therefore, the Scheme of the Code not only ensures that the time of the police should not be wasted on false and frivolous information but also that the police should not intentionally refrain from doing their duty of investigating cognizable offences. As a result, the apprehension of misuse of the provision of mandatory registration of FIR is unfounded and speculative in nature.

104) It is the stand of Mr. Naphade, learned senior counsel for the State of Maharashtra that when an innocent person is falsely implicated, he not only suffers from loss of reputation but also from mental tension and his personal liberty is seriously impaired. He relied on the Maneka Gandhi (supra), which held the proposition that the law which deprives a person of his personal liberty must be reasonable both from the stand point of substantive as well as procedural aspect is now firmly established in our Constitutional law. Therefore, he pleaded for a fresh look at Section 154 of the Code, which interprets Section 154 of the Code in conformity with the mandate of Article

21.

105) It is true that a delicate balance has to be maintained between the interest of the society and protecting the liberty of an individual. As already discussed above, there are already sufficient safeguards provided in the Code which duly protect the liberty of an individual in case of registration of false FIR. At the same time, Section 154 was drafted keeping in mind the interest of the victim and the society. Therefore, we are of the cogent view that mandatory registration of FIRs under Section 154 of the Code will not be in contravention of Article 21 of the Constitution as purported by various counsel. Exceptions:

106. Although, we, in unequivocal terms, hold that Section 154 of the Code postulates the mandatory registration of FIRs on receipt of all cognizable offence,

yet, there may be instances where preliminary inquiry may be required owing to the change in genesis and novelty of crimes with the passage of time. One such instance is in the case of allegations relating to medical negligence on the part of doctors. It will be unfair and inequitable to prosecute a medical professional only on the basis of the allegations in the complaint. 107) In the context of medical negligence cases, in *Jacob Mathew (supra)*, it was held by this Court as under: ¶.51. We may not be understood as holding that doctors can never be prosecuted for an offence of which rashness or negligence is an essential ingredient. All that we are doing is to emphasise the need for care and caution in the interest of society; for, the service which the medical profession renders to human beings is probably the noblest of all, and hence there is a need for protecting doctors from frivolous or unjust prosecutions. Many a complainant prefer recourse to criminal process as a tool for pressurising the medical professional for extracting uncalled for or unjust compensation. Such malicious proceedings have to be guarded against.

52. Statutory rules or executive instructions incorporating certain guidelines need to be framed and issued by the Government of India and/or the State Governments in consultation with the Medical Council of India. So long as it is not done, we propose to lay down certain guidelines for the future which should govern the prosecution of doctors for offences of which criminal rashness or criminal negligence is an ingredient. A private complaint may not be entertained unless the complainant has produced prima facie evidence before the court in the form of a credible opinion given by another competent doctor to support the charge of rashness or negligence on the part of the accused doctor. The investigating officer should, before proceeding against the doctor accused of rash or negligent act or omission, obtain an independent and competent medical opinion preferably from a doctor in government service, qualified in that branch of medical practice who can normally be expected to give an impartial and unbiased opinion applying the Bolam⁹ test to the facts collected in the investigation. A doctor accused of rashness or negligence, may not be arrested in a routine manner (simply because a charge has been levelled against him). Unless his arrest is necessary for furthering the investigation or for collecting evidence or unless the investigating officer feels satisfied that the doctor proceeded against

would not make himself available to face the prosecution unless arrested, the arrest may be withheld. 108) In the context of offences relating to corruption, this Court in *P. Sirajuddin* (supra) expressed the need for a preliminary inquiry before proceeding against public servants. 109) Similarly, in *Tapan Kumar Singh* (supra), this Court has validated a preliminary inquiry prior to registering an FIR only on the ground that at the time the first information is received, the same does not disclose a cognizable offence. 110) Therefore, in view of various counter claims regarding registration or non-registration, what is necessary is only that the information given to the police must disclose the commission of a cognizable offence. In such a situation, registration of an FIR is mandatory. However, if no cognizable offence is made out in the information given, then the FIR need not be registered immediately and perhaps the police can conduct a sort of preliminary verification or inquiry for the limited purpose of ascertaining as to whether a cognizable offence has been committed. But, if the information given clearly mentions the commission of a cognizable offence, there is no other option but to register an FIR forthwith. Other considerations are not relevant at the stage of registration of FIR, such as, whether the information is falsely given, whether the information is genuine, whether the information is credible etc. These are the issues that have to be verified during the investigation of the FIR. At the stage of registration of FIR, what is to be seen is merely whether the information given *ex facie* discloses the commission of a cognizable offence. If, after investigation, the information given is found to be false, there is always an option to prosecute the complainant for filing a false FIR. Conclusion/Directions:

111. In view of the aforesaid discussion, we hold: i) Registration of FIR is mandatory under Section 154 of the Code, if the information discloses commission of a cognizable offence and no preliminary inquiry is permissible in such a situation. ii) If the information received does not disclose a cognizable offence but indicates the necessity for an inquiry, a preliminary inquiry may be conducted only to ascertain whether cognizable offence is disclosed or not. iii) If the inquiry discloses the commission of a cognizable offence, the FIR must be registered. In cases where preliminary inquiry ends in closing the complaint, a copy of the entry of such closure must be supplied to the first informant forthwith and not later than one week. It must disclose reasons in brief for closing the complaint and not

proceeding further. iv) The police officer cannot avoid his duty of registering offence if cognizable offence is disclosed. Action must be taken against erring officers who do not register the FIR if information received by him discloses a cognizable offence. v) The scope of preliminary inquiry is not to verify the veracity or otherwise of the information received but only to ascertain whether the information reveals any cognizable offence. vi) As to what type and in which cases preliminary inquiry is to be conducted will depend on the facts and circumstances of each case. The category of cases in which preliminary inquiry may be made are as under: a) Matrimonial disputes/ family disputes b) Commercial offences c) Medical negligence cases d) Corruption cases e) Cases where there is abnormal delay/laches in initiating criminal prosecution, for example, over 3 months delay in reporting the matter without satisfactorily explaining the reasons for delay. The aforesaid are only illustrations and not exhaustive of all conditions which may warrant preliminary inquiry. vii) While ensuring and protecting the rights of the accused and the complainant, a preliminary inquiry should be made time bound and in any case it should not exceed 7 days. The fact of such delay and the causes of it must be reflected in the General Diary entry. viii) Since the General Diary/Station Diary/Daily Diary is the record of all information received in a police station, we direct that all information relating to cognizable offences, whether resulting in registration of FIR or leading to an inquiry, must be mandatorily and meticulously reflected in the said Diary and the decision to conduct a preliminary inquiry must also be reflected, as mentioned above.

5. We are certain that the Director General of Police would share our concern and do all within his power to ensure observance of law. We would recommend education, formation of monitoring committees, administrative action against erring personnel and issue of guidelines and instructions from time to time. 6. These petitions are ordered as above. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed. 16.03.2015 Index :Yes/No Internet:Yes Note to Registry: A copy of the order should be forwarded to the Secretary, Home Department, State of Tamil Nadu, Fort St. George, Chennai and DGP, Tamil Nadu. RR C.T.SELVAM, J.

To 1.The Inspector of Police, (Crimes) Tallakulam Police Station, Madurai City
2.The Additional Public Prosecutor, Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,

Madurai. CRL.O.P.(MD) Nos.4326, 4328, 4330, 4345, 4361, 4386, 4397, 4407, 4418, 4461, 4478, 4505, 4510, 4517, 4520, 4522, 4524, 4525, 4527, 4531, 4537, 4540, 4541, 4542, 4543, 4623 4546, 4547, 4548, 4549, 4550, 4554, 4555, 4559, 4560, 4562, 4568, 4571, 4584, 4588, 4600, 4610, 4616, 4619, 4620, 4621, 4622, 423, 4624, 4625, 4628, 4629, 4632, 4640, 4642, 4656, 4665, 4672, 4679, 4680, 4681, 4682, 4683, 4685, 4686, 4688, 4693, 4694 and 4698 of 2015 and connected Miscellaneous Petitions 16.03.2015

SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com