

Company: Sol Infotech Pvt. Ltd.

Website: www.courtkutchehry.com

**Printed For:** 

Date: 21/10/2025

## Hajee P.M. Meeranan and Another Vs P. Venugopal, Special Officer, Kanjirappally Municipality

Criminal H.C. No. 1349 of 1991

Court: High Court Of Kerala

Date of Decision: June 26, 1992

**Acts Referred:** 

Criminal Procedure Code, 1973 (CrPC) â€" Section 256, 256(2)

Citation: (1993) CriLJ 364: (1993) 1 ILR (Ker) 128: (1992) 2 KLJ 210

Hon'ble Judges: M.M. Pareed Pillay, J

Bench: Single Bench

Advocate: M.V. Ibrahimkutty, for the Appellant; K.K. Chandran Pillai, for the Respondent

Final Decision: Allowed

## **Judgement**

## @JUDGMENTTAG-ORDER

M.M. Pareed Pillay, J.

Petitioners are accused 1 and 2 in S.T. 919 of 1991 of the Judicial Magistrate of First Class, Kanjirappally. They

seek to quash the complaint, chiefly on the ground that the complaint filed by the Kanjirappally Municipality cannot be sustained as the

complainant-Municipality is no longer in existence.

2. The short point that arises for consideration is whether the complaint filed by the Municipality survives when that body is no longer in existence.

In other words, can the Panchayat which steps into the shoes of the Municipality prosecute the complaint under the Municipalities Act? Admittedly

Kanjirappally Municipality has ceased to exist and now it is only a Panchayat. If that be so, the complaint under Sections 228, 320, 247, 248 and

357 of the Municipalities Act cannot be continued by the Panchayat, Kanjirappally Panchayat cannot be termed as the successor of the

Municipality for the purpose of pursuing the criminal complaint. Offences made out under the aforementioned sections of the Municipalities Act

cannot obviously be continued by the authorities of the Panchayat. In view of the non-existence of the Municipality, it would not be possible for the

complainant to appear before the Court.

3. Section 256, Cr. P.C. provides that if the summons has been issued on complaint, and on the day appointed for the appearance of the accused,

or any day subsequent thereto to which the hearing may be adjourned, the complainant does not appear, the Magistrate shall, notwithstanding

anything herein before contained, acquit the accused, unless for some reason he thinks it proper to adjourn the hearing of the case to some other

day. Sub-section (2) has been added to make a legal provision that death and absence of the complainant stand in the same footing in the matter of

ending or proceeding with the case. As regards the sub-section Law Commission in its 41st report says:

A question has arisen whether the complainant's death ends the proceedings in a summons case; and we find that different views have been

expressed on this question. As a matter of policy we think the answer should depend on the nature of the case and the stage of proceedings at

which death occurs. It is impracticable to detail the various situations that may arise and the considerations that may have to be weighed. We think,

in the circumstances that the decision should be left to the judicial discretion of the court, and the legal provision need only be that death and

absence stand on the same footing. We trust this will in practice work satisfactorily.

As the complaint under the various sections of the Municipalities Act cannot be pursued by the successor Panchayat and as there is no enabling

provision to do so, it has to be necessarily held that the complaint cannot be proceeded with any further. In that view of the matter, the complaint

(S.T. 919 of 1991) is quashed.

The petition is allowed.