
(1990) 07 SC CK 0020

In the Supreme Court Of India

Case No : Criminal Appeal No. 387 of 1990

Dr. Laksmansingh Himatsingh Vaghela

APPELLANT

Vs

Naresh Kumar Chandrashanker Jha and others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 24-07-1990

Acts Referred:

Companies Act, 1956 — Section 617
Criminal Procedure Code, 1973 (CrPC) — Section 197, 482
Penal Code, 1860 (IPC) — Section 201, 21, 465, 468
Prevention of Food Adulteration Act, 1954 — Section 8

Citation : AIR 1990 SC 1976 : (1990) CriLJ 1921 : (1990) 2 GLR 1182 : (1990) 3 JT 241 : (1990) 2 PLJR 79 : (1990) 2 SCALE 136 : (1990) 4 SCC 169 : (1990) 3 SCR 511

Hon'ble Judges : T. K. Thommen, J;M. Fathima Beevi, J;Kuldip Singh, J

Bench : Full Bench

Advocate : G. Ramaswamy, Additional Solicitor General, T.V. S. Krishnamoorthy Iyer, S.S. Ray, Y.S. Chitale and Joachin Dias, for the Appellant; B. Datta, Sunil Dogra and P.H. Parekh, for the Respondent

Final Decision : Allowed

Judgement

1. Leave granted.

2. The appellant is aggrieved by the judgment of the High Court holding that sanction of the State Government as required u/s 197, Cr.P.C, is not necessary for taking cognizance of the offences against the appellant on the basis of the complaint filed by the respondent. The appellant is an employee of the Municipal Corporation, Ahmedabad. While holding the post of Laboratory Officer, the State Government by a Notification dated 21.12.1966 u/s 8 of the Food Adulteration Act, 1954 appointed the appellant as a Public Analyst for the local area comprised within the limits of the Corporation. The complaint was filed by the respondent before the Magistrate for the offences punishable under Sections 465, 468 and 201, I.P.C., alleged to have been committed by the appellant while exercising the functions as Public Analyst.

3. The appellant moved the High Court u/s 482, Cr.P.C, for quashing the criminal proceedings on the ground that, he being a public servant removable from office only by the State Government the Magistrate could not take cognizance of the offence alleged to have been committed while discharging the duties as Public Analyst without the requisite sanction u/s 197, Cr.P.C. The High Court rejected this contention and dismissed the petition.

4. u/s 197(1), Cr.P.C, when a public servant not removable from his office save by or with the sanction of the Government, is accused of any offence alleged to have been committed by him while acting or purporting to act in the discharge of his official duty, no Court shall take cognizance of such offence except with the previous sanction of the Government. The section extends immunity from irresponsible, frivolous and vexatious prosecution. The privilege of immunity from prosecution without sanction extends only when the accused is a public servant of the kind mentioned therein. He must be a public servant as defined in Section 21 of the Indian Penal Code and not removable from his office save by or with the sanction of the State Government or the Central Government as the case may be. The offence must also be one committed by the accused while acting or purporting to act in the discharge of his official duty. Section 21, I.P.C., reads as under:

21. "Public servant"?The words "public servant" denote a person falling under any of the descriptions hereinafter following, namely:

..... Twelfth.?Every person?

(a) in the service or pay of the Government or remunerated by fess or commission for the performance of any public duty by the Government;

(b) in the service or pay of a local authority, a corporation established by or under a Central, Provincial or State Act or a Government company as defined in Section 617 of the Companies Act, 1956 (1 of 1956).

5. Section 197, Cr.P.C, clearly intends to draw a line between public servants and to provide that only in the case of the higher ranks should the sanction of the government to their prosecution be necessary. While a public servant holding an office of the kind mentioned in the Section is as such public servant appointed to another office, his official acts in connection with the latter office will also relate to the former office. The words "removable from office" occurring in Section 197 signify removal from the office he is holding. The authority mentioned in the section is the authority under which the officer is serving and competent to terminate his services. If the accused is under the service and pay of the local authority, the appointment to an office for exercising functions under a particular statute will not alter his status as an employee of the local authority.

6. The appellant herein is admittedly the Laboratory Officer in the service and pay of the Municipal Corporation of Ahmedabad. The appointment as Public

Analyst by the Government does not confer on him the status of a public servant or an officer under the service and pay of the Government. He is not remunerated by any fee by the Government. The appellant was not the employee of the State Government and was not employed in connection with the affairs of the State. He was not holding any public office in connection with the affairs of the State. The State Government had merely entrusted him with the functions of a Public Analyst which could be granted and taken by an administrative act. It was on account of his being employed by the Municipal Corporation that he was appointed as a Public Analyst by the Government. He is not appointed as Public Analyst in the cadre against any post. The Prevention of Food Adulteration Act also does not contain any deeming provision to treat the Public Analyst as a public-servant.

7. The appellant is holding an office from which he is removable by the Local Authority and not by the Government. The cancellation of the appointment as Public Analyst would not amount to removal from office. Section 197, Cr.P.C, in this context contemplates the removal of the appellant from the office of the Laboratory Officer and not his transfer or removal from the office of the Public Analyst. The removal of the appellant from the office of Public Analyst would not affect his office as a Laboratory Officer under the Local Authority and would not amount to removal from office. The appellant is not therefore a public servant removable only by the State Government. The High Court was right in its view. We accordingly dismiss the appeal.