
S. Shankar Vs The State and Others

Criminal R.C. No. 1423 of 2006 and Criminal M.P. No. 1 of 2006

Court: Madras High Court

Date of Decision: Dec. 14, 2006

Citation: (2007) 1 LW(Cri) 78 : (2007) 1 LW(Cri) 431

Hon'ble Judges: R. Regupathi, J

Bench: Single Bench

Advocate: R. Srinivas, for the Appellant; P. Kumaresan, Additional Public Prosecutor for Respondent No. 1 and Ram and Ram, for the Respondent

Judgement

@JUDGMENTTAG-ORDER

R. Regupathi, J.

The petitioner is the de facto complainant in C.C.No.3533 of 2001 on the file of the learned IV Metropolitan Magistrate,

Saidapet, Chennai. The examination of the witnesses of the prosecution has been almost completed including P.W. 6, the Investigating Officer. At

that that, a petition has been filed by the prosecution to mark certain documents, which were opposed by the accused, resulting in the order

impugned, refusing such permission.

2. The learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that document Nos. 1 to 18 are communications between the de facto complainant and the first

accused and they have come into existence even during the course of investigation and the same has been received by P.W. 6. Document Nos. 19

and 20 are income tax returns. Documents Nos. 21 to 31 are proceedings between A-1 and the petitioner in the competent court. Document Nos.

32 to 34 are documents relating to the restraining orders passed by the U.S. Government. Document Nos. 35 and 36 are divorce proceedings. In

the order impugned, the learned Magistrate has refused to entertain these documents on the ground that some of the documents are xerox copies,

not relevant and an attempt has been made to fill up the lacuna at a belated stage. The learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that certified

copies of the documents are produced and some of the documents are public documents. All the documents are relevant to decide the issue in

question and the relevancy of the same can be tested during the course of cross examination, agitated at the time of arguments and decided one

way or other by the trial Court. Under such circumstances, sought for setting aside the order passed by the learned Magistrate and prayed for a

direction to the learned Magistrate to mark the documents listed in the petition during course of Trial. It is further submitted that for such purpose,

witnesses 1, 2 and 6 may be recalled and the learned Magistrate may be directed in this regard. The learned Counsel for the petitioner relied on

the following judgments to substantiate his contentions:

1. Central Bureau of Investigation Vs. v.C. Shukla and Others,
2. Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI) Vs. R.S. Pai and Another,
3. (2001) 3 SCC 1 (Bipin Shantilal Panchal v. State of Gujarat and Anr.)
4. Rajendra Prasad Vs. The Narcotic Cell Through its Officer in Charge, Delhi,

3. Per Contra, the learned Counsel for the respondents 2 to 4 submits that all the documents listed in the petitions are irrelevant. The petitioner/de

facto complainant is introducing these documents only for the purpose of delaying the trial. These documents have not been collected during the

course of investigation. In the petition, the reason for marking these documents have not been stated. All these documents are business documents

and they do not have any relevance for the purpose of adjudication in the case. These documents were in the custody of the petitioner and would

have been marked during the course of the trial. After the cross-examination has been completed, this attempt is being made only for the purpose

of filling up the lacuna. It is further submitted that document Nos. 1 to 18 are not connected with the case. I.T. Returns and other documents are

not relevant for the purpose of adjudication of the case.

4. I have heard both the counsels and perused the materials available on record.

5. The trial is under progress. The prosecution witnesses have been cross-examined at length. During the course of trial, several documents have

been received to substantiate the case of the prosecution. The de facto complainant is of the opinion that the listed documents are relevant and

necessary and if these documents are not produced at this juncture, it may cause great prejudice to her. During the course of investigation and trial,

if any fresh material comes to light, there cannot be any prohibition in receiving those materials for the purpose of proving or disproving the

allegations made by the prosecution. In various Supreme Court judgments including the judgment cited by the counsel for the petitioner, it has been

repeatedly held that entry of such material cannot be prevented at the inception. It is the contention of the petitioner that such documents are

relevant and absolutely necessary. It is equally opposed on the side of the respondents 2 to 5/accused that it is unnecessary, irrelevant and these

documents are produced only for the purpose of filling up the lacuna and protracting the proceedings. I am of the considered opinion that the

production of the documents and materials cannot be prevented during the course trial. The relevancy of the same will be decided on conclusion of

the trial by the Presiding Officer. Under such circumstances, the learned Magistrate is directed to allow the list of the documents to be marked

while recalling P.Ws. 1, 2 and 6 in the case and he is also directed to take up the case on day to day basis. The revision petition is ordered

accordingly. Consequently, connected CrI.M.P. is closed.