

Court No. - 65

Case :- CRIMINAL MISC. WRIT PETITION No. - 2798 of 2019

Petitioner :- Shamim Kuraishi And 3 Others

Respondent :- State Of U.P. And 3 Others

Counsel for Petitioner :- Lalit Singh Tomar

Counsel for Respondent :- G.A.

Hon'ble Karuna Nand Bajpayee,J.

Hon'ble Ifaqat Ali Khan,J.

This writ petition has been filed seeking the quashing of F.I.R. dated 09.12.2018 registered as Case Crime No.562 of 2018, under Sections 307 I.P.C. Section 11 of Prevention of Cruelty of Animal Act and Section 4/25 Arms Act, P.S.- Kotwali Hata, District- Kushinagar.

Heard petitioners' counsel and learned AGA.

Entire record has been perused.

Submission of learned counsel for the petitioners is that the petitioners have not committed any offence and they have been falsely implicated by the co-accused Qayamuddin as at earlier point of time he had some altercations with the petitioners. Further submission is that there is no medical report available on record and as such the present case is of no injury. Certain other contentions have also been raised by the petitioners' counsel which relate to disputed questions of fact. The court has also been called upon to adjudge the worth of prosecution allegations and evaluate the same on the basis of various intricacies of factual details which have been touched upon by the learned counsel. The veracity and credibility of indictment has been questioned, absence of material which may substantiate the allegations has been contended and false implication has been pleaded.

The law regarding sufficiency of grounds which may justify quashing of F.I.R. in a given case is well settled. The court has to eschew itself from embarking upon a roving enquiry into the last details of the case. It is also not advisable to adjudge whether the case shall ultimately end in submission of charge sheet and then eventually in conviction or not. Only a prima facie satisfaction of the court about the existence of sufficient ingredients constituting the offence is required in order to see whether the F.I.R. requires to be investigated or deserves quashing. The ambit of investigation into the alleged offence is

an independent area of operation and does not call for interference in the same except in rarest of rare cases. The view taken in the case of ***Satyapal vs. State of U.P. and others, 2000 Cr.L.J. 569*** which was further confirmed by another Full Bench of this Court in the case of ***Ajit Singh @ Muraha v. State of U.P. and others (2006 (56) ACC 433)*** makes the position of law in this regard clear and this Court does not find it advisable to whittle down the power or scope of investigation in the given case. The operational liberty to collect sufficient material, if there exists any, cannot be scuttled prematurely by any uncalled for overstepping of the Court. It has to be an extremely discreet exercise.

The Apex Court decisions given in the case of **R.P. Kapur Vs. State of Punjab AIR 1960 SC 866** and in the case of **State of Haryana Vs. Bhajan Lal 1992 SCC(Cr.) 426** have also recognized certain categories by way of illustration which may justify the quashing of a complaint or charge sheet and the same may also be good grounds to quash the F.I.R. Some of them are akin to the illustrative examples given in the case of ***Smt. Nagawwa Vs. Veeranna Shivalingappa Konjalgi 1976 3 SCC 736***. The cases where the allegations made against the accused in the F.I.R. or the evidence collected by the Investigating Officer do not constitute any offence or where the allegations are absurd or extremely improbable or impossible to believe or where prosecution is legally barred or where criminal proceeding is malicious and malafide instituted only with ulterior motive or grudge and vengeance alone, may be illustratively the fit cases for the High Court in which the F.I.R. or the criminal proceedings may be quashed. If a particular case falls in some such categories as recognized by the Apex Court in **Bhajan Lal's** case, it may justify the interference by this Court in exercise of its inherent power as provided in Code of Criminal Procedure or in exercise of its powers vested by the Constitution of India.

Illumined by the case law referred to herein above, this Court has adverted to the entire record of the case.

The perusal of the F.I.R. would reveal that the F.I.R. in the present case was lodged by Sub-Inspector of Police Mahendra Yadav, police station Kotwali Hata, District Kushinagar on 9.12.2018 against the petitioners and three other co-accused persons. The prosecution allegations in brief are that on information of one informer the first informant and other police personnel tried to stop a pick-up vehicle near Hata Furlane Bridge. But after seeing the police party the driver of the said pick-up vehicle instead of stopping the vehicle, had tried to

crush the police personnel due to which the first informant and other police personnel fell on the road but their lives were saved. However, they chased the vehicle and thereafter five persons alighted from the said vehicle and made their escape good but the driver of the aforesaid vehicle Qayamuddin was arrested by the police. On interrogation the driver stated that the persons who had escaped from the site were the owners of the animals which were loaded in the said vehicle. The arrested driver of the vehicle had named the petitioners and two other co-accused persons who were purchasers of the animals (buffaloes and calves) which were purchased for the purposes of slaughtering. A knife was recovered from the said pick up vehicle. When the police party searched the aforesaid vehicle they found that two buffaloes and five calves were brutally tied and were loaded in the back portion of the vehicle. Some of the animals were having injuries also. The first informant had also prepared recovery memo.

The submissions made by the petitioners' learned counsel call for determination on pure questions of fact which may be adequately discerned only through proper investigation. This Court does not deem it proper, and therefore cannot be persuaded to have a pre-trial before the actual trial begins or where the investigating agency should not be given fullest opportunity to make proper enquiry and reach at the just conclusions in the matter. This Court does not deem it proper to suffocate or trammel the ambit and scope of independent investigation into the case. A threadbare discussion of various facts and circumstances, as they emerge from the allegations made against the accused, is being purposely avoided by the Court for the reason, lest the same might cause any prejudice to either side during investigation or trial. But it shall suffice to observe that the perusal of the record makes out prima facie offences at this stage and there appear to be sufficient ground for investigation in the case. We do not find any justification to quash the F.I.R. or the proceedings against the accused arising out of it as the case does not fall in any of the categories recognized by the Apex Court which may justify their quashing.

The prayer for quashing the same is refused as we do not see any breach of constitutional provisions or any abuse of the process of law.

The writ petition stands dismissed.

Order Date :- 31.1.2019

shiv