

(2010) 09 AHC CK 0122
In the Allahabad High Court
Case No : Application No. 30247 of 2010

Sirajul Haq Ansari and Others

APPELLANT

Vs

State of U.P. and Another

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 22-09-2010

Acts Referred:

Criminal Procedure Code, 1973 (CrPC) — Section 227, 228, 239, 245(2), 482
Penal Code, 1860 (IPC) — Section 323, 379, 452

Citation : (2010) 09 AHC CK 0122

Hon'ble Judges : Rajesh Dayal Khare, J

Bench : Single Bench

Judgement

Rajesh Dayal Khare, J.—Heard learned Counsel for the applicants and learned A.G.A. for the State-respondent.

2. The present 482 Cr.P.C. petition has been filed for quashing the proceedings of complaint case No. 3976 of 2009, under Sections 452, 323, 379 IPC, pending before the Judicial Magistrate, Basti, as well as for quashing of the summoning order dated 22.5.2010.

3. It is contended by the learned Counsel for the applicants that the injuries were examined after nine days of the alleged incident. It is further contended that the complaint has been filed only on account of political reasons. It is thus contended on behalf of the applicants that the criminal prosecution of the applicants is bad in law.

4. The contention of the counsel for the applicants is that no offence against the applicants is disclosed and the present prosecution has been instituted with a malafide intention for the purposes of harassment. He pointed out certain documents and statements in support of his contention.

5. From the perusal of the material on record and looking into the facts of the case at this stage it cannot be said that no offence is made out against the applicants. All the submission made at the bar relates to the disputed question of

fact, which cannot be adjudicated upon by this Court u/s 482 Cr.P.C. At this stage only prima facie case is to be seen in the light of the law laid down by Supreme Court in cases of R.P. Kapur Vs. The State of Punjab, , State of Haryana v. Bhajan Lal 1992 SCC (Cr.) 426, State of Bihar v. P.P. Sharma 1992 SCC (Cr.) 192 and lastly Zandu Pharmaceutical Works Ltd. v. Mohd. Saraful Haq and Anr. (Para-10) 2005 SCC (Cr.) 283. The disputed defence of the accused cannot be considered at this stage. Moreover, the applicants have got right of discharge under Sections 239, 227/228 or 245(2) Cr.P.C. as the case may be through a proper application for the said purpose and they are free to take all the submissions in the said discharge application before the Trial Court.

6. The prayer for quashing the proceedings of complaint case and for quashing of the summoning order dated 22.5.2010, is hereby refused.

7. However, it is directed that the applicants shall appear and surrender before the court below within 30 days from today and apply for bail, their prayer for bail shall be considered and decided in view of the settled law laid by this Court in the case of Amrawati and Anr. v. State of U.P. reported in 2004 (57) ALR 290 as well as Judgment passed by Hon"ble Apex Court reported in 2009 (3) ADJ 322 (SC) Lal Kamendra Pratap Singh v. State of U.P. For a period of 30 days from today or till the disposal of the application for grant of bail whichever is earlier, no coercive action shall be taken against the applicants. However in case the applicants do not appear before the Court below within the aforesaid period, coercive action shall be taken against them.

8. With the aforesaid directions, this application is finally disposed of.