

In Re: K. Srirangachariar

In Re: K. Srirangachariar

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/816913

Court : Chennai

Decided On : Aug-03-1934

Reported in : 152Ind.Cas.154

Judge : Pandrang Row, J.

Appellant : In Re: K. Srirangachariar

Judgement :

ORDER

Pandrang Row, J.

1. The petitioner was committed to the Chingleput Sessions Court to take his trial on two separate charges accusing him of two distinct offences, viz., the offence of theft of a blank second class Railway ticket from the South Indian Railway Company's booking office at Conjeevaram punishable under Section 380 of the Indian Penal Code, and the offence of forgery in respect of certain entries alleged to have (been) made by him in that ticket with intent that fraud may be committed, punishable under Section 467, Indian Penal Code.

2. The trial of the petitioner was proceeded with at first only in respect of the first offence, i.e., the offence of theft. This trial in respect of the offence of theft which was held by the Assistant Sessions Judge, Chingleput, with the aid of the jury ended in acquittal. Thereupon the trial of the petitioner in respect of the 2nd offence, the offence of forgery, was taken up by the Sessions Judge, Chingleput.

The petitioner contended that his acquittal in the earlier trial was a bar to the subsequent trial. The contention was repelled by the Sessions Judge in a reasoned order dated December 20, 1933.

3. The present Revision Petition attacks the correctness of this order of the Sessions Judge and seeks to have it reversed. The only argument is that Sections 236 and 237, Criminal Procedure Code, apply to the present case and that consequently the previous acquittal is a bar under Section 403(1), Criminal Procedure Code. This argument was considered by the learned Sessions Judge and did not meet with acceptance.

4. This is not a case in which there can be any doubt as to which of several offences the facts which can be proved will constitute; on the contrary the facts which can be proved clearly disclose two distinct offences and only two, viz., the offence of theft and the offence of forgery. In other words, the case is one to which Section 235(1), Criminal Procedure Code, applies, the case for the prosecution being that the petitioner first stole a blank Railway ticket from the booking office to which he had access as a relative of the Station Master, and then committed forgery by making certain entries therein so that a fraud may be committed on the Railway Company. An analogous case would be one in which a person is charged with theft of a blank cheque form and subsequent forgery thereof. It is clear from Section 403(2), Criminal Procedure Code that a previous acquittal is no bar to a trial for any distinct offence for which a separate charge might have been made in the former trial under Section 235(1), Criminal Procedure Code. Section 235(1) and Section 236, Criminal Procedure Code are mutually exclusive, and if a case is governed by one of them it cannot be governed by the other. Section 237, Criminal Procedure Code obviously applied only to cases governed by Section 236, Criminal Procedure Code.

5. I am of opinion that the order of the Sessions Judge sought to be set aside in revision is right. The petition is, therefore, dismissed.