

In the court of 2ND ADDL CJM Court DAHOD

Order Below Ex 1

DAHOD RURAL DAHOD Police Station II **CR No-11821008250149/2025 MV Act 185 prohi 66b 85**

Accused Name- Ajitbhai Kikabhai Rathod

This Order has been passed in Two parts wherein Part A will denote regarding Sec 185 and In part B, I will deliberate regarding New Prohi Act sec 66b 85

Part A- DELIBERATION ON SEC 185

This litigation is filed u/s 185 of MVA Act. Ld App is heard vehemently in this regard. The core Question for determination for this Court is whether this Court can take cognizance in such offence? Whether this offence is Non- Cognizable? Answer lies negative by discussion as follows:

1. S 510 of IPC 1860 postulates that the person who do misconduct in public place in drunken state in intoxication shall be punished simple imp of 24 hours. This Offense was also Non-cognizable.
2. Now we shall jump to S 185 which envisaged that the offense by driving vehicle by drunken person. The Offences under M.V Act 184 & 185 are non –cognizable offences, Hence police cannot file chargesheet without permission of the Court as per bar of section 155(2) of Cr.P.C. If cognizance taken by the learned Magistrate of offences punishable under **Sec. 184 and 185 of the Code on a charge sheet submitted by the police officer after an investigation in violation of Sec. 155(2) of the Code is illegal.** The said charge sheet cannot also be deemed to be a complaint as defined under Sec.2(d) of the Code. **Cognizance taken being illegal is liable to be quashed.** I relied upon following authorities which are shared with Ld App but no contrary legal view has been reported to this Court.

JUDGMENTS

- **Rani Shashank Doshi v. State of Maharashtra (2014) 1 BOMCR(CRI) 339**
It has been held that....

Motor Vehicles Act (59 of 1988) S. 185 as amended by Amendment Act (54 of 1994) - Drunken driving -Offence under S. 185 — Is not cognizable — Merely because power to arrest without warrant is conferred in police officer in uniform it would not mean that the offence is cognizable.

*Merely because the power to arrest without warrant is conferred in a police officer in uniform, it does not mean that the offence is cognizable. Even if a person is to be subjected to the tests breath analysis, the police officer must have a reasonable cause to suspect him of having committed an offence punishable under Section 185. Therefore, if there is a reasonable cause to suspect a person having committed an offence punishable under Section 185, that he can be subjected to a Breath Test and by calling upon him or requiring him to subject himself to such test, is not necessarily arrest. He could be arrested provided a Breath Test carried out on him indicating presence of alcohol in his blood. He cannot be arrested if he is at a hospital as an indoor patient. If the person concerned refuses to provide a specimen of breath for a Breath Test or fails to do so and a police officer has a reasonable cause to suspect him of having alcohol in his blood that he may arrest that person except while that person is in hospital as a indoor patient. Even after his arrest he shall while at police station be given an opportunity to provide a specimen of breath for a Breath Test. Therefore, with all this it is not as if the offence can be said to be cognizable. Additionally also because of the extent of punishment, namely, imprisonment for less than two years that a conclusion can safely be reached that an offence punishable under **Section 185 of the***

Mtf Act is not cognizable. (Paras24,45)

- Sandeep Indravadan Sagar v. State of Maharashtra 2013 CRI. L. J. 1147

Criminal P.C S.154, S.157— @page-CriLJ1148F.I.R. - Receipt and recording of - Is not a condition precedent for investigation into a cognizable offence. The investigation of, or into a cognizable offence must be preceded by registration of the First Information Report, is not a sound proposition of law. It is true that ordinarily, it would only be on the basis of the First Information Report that the police machinery would be made aware of the offence and, therefore, ordinarily there would be a First Information Report recorded in accordance with the provisions of Section 154 of the Code, before the investigation into a cognizable offence or case commences. However, to suggest that the power to investigate flows from the registration of the First Information Report would be totally incorrect. The receipt and recording of First Information Report is not a condition precedent for investigation into a cognizable offence. It is clear from the provisions of Section 157 of the Code, which speaks of the procedure for investigation, that the investigation can commence, if the officer in charge of a police station has reason to suspect the commission of a cognizable offence; and this reason can be formed from the information received or otherwise. The provision for giving information, therefore, is not to provide the police with the power of investigation, but to enable an unembellished version of the incident to be given at the earliest (opportunity), so that the prosecution case at the trial may be tested. (Pr 10)

*Criminal P.C. (2 of 1974) , S.2(c)— Motor vehicles Act (59 of 1988) , **S.202, S.185 Driving by drunken person - Offence of - Is non-cognizable - Limited power to arrest such person without warrant given to police officer in uniform did not make offence under S. 185 cognizable offence** . Criminal M. C. NO. 702 of 2011, D/- 30-3-2011 (Kerala H.C.), Followed.(Para20) (Para 20) Criminal*

P.C. (2 of 1974) , S.155(2)— Motor vehicles Act (59 of 1988) , S.185— Driving by drunken person - Offence of - Investigation of offence punishable under S. 185 as provided in Motor vehicles Act (1988) would prevail over provisions of Criminal P. C. which prohibit investigation into a non-cognizable offence without order of Magistrate - Subjecting such person to Breath analysis test and thus collecting evidence without order of Magistrate, permissible. Indeed the holding of Breath analysis Test and Laboratory Test, is a process of collection of evidence. It has to be accepted that it is a part of investigation. However, the contention that 'if the offence is held to be non-cognizable then, investigation into it cannot be carried out without an order from the Magistrate, in view of the bar created by sub-section (2) of Section 155 of the Criminal Procedure Code', is not acceptable. It has already been noticed that the procedure with respect to investigation of offences, as laid down in the Criminal Procedure Code, is applicable to the offences punishable even under a special law (like the Motor vehicles Act) but, subject to any special procedure prescribed there under (or any other law for the time being in force) for the investigation or trial of such offences. A reading of Sections 4 and 5 of the Code, leaves no manner of doubt that where a different procedure than one prescribed in the Code, is laid down for the investigation, inquiry or trial of any offences under any law other than the Penal Code, such special procedure shall prevail over the provisions in the Code, with respect to the investigation of offences. Thus, the provisions in the M. tf. Act regarding the investigation of the offences punishable under Section 185 of the M. tf. Act, will prevail over the provisions in the Code, which prohibit investigation into a non-cognizable offence without an order of a Magistrate. There is, therefore, no illegality committed by the police in subjecting the persons apprehended on the allegation of having committed the offence punishable under Section 185 of the M. tf. Act to

Breath analysis Test, and in having collected 'evidence' of the offences.

Keshav Lal Thakur V/s. State of Bihar (1996 (11) SCC 557).

The offence under Section 31 of the Representation of the People Act, 1950 is non-cognizable and therefore the police could not have registered a case for such an offence under Section 154 Criminal Procedure Code. Of course, the police is entitled to investigate into a non-cognizable offence pursuant to an order of a competent Magistrate under Section 155(2) Criminal Procedure Code but, admittedly, no such order was passed in the instant case. That necessarily means, that neither the police could investigate into the offence in question nor submit a report on which the question of taking cognizance could have arisen. While on this point, it may be mentioned that in view of the Explanation to Section 2(d) Criminal Procedure Code, which defines 'complaint', the police is entitled to submit, after investigation, a report relating to a non-cognizable offence in which case such a report is to be treated as a 'complaint' of the police officer concerned, but that explanation will not be available to the prosecution here as that relates to a case where the police initiates investigation into a cognizable offence unlike the present one but ultimately finds that only a non-cognizable offence has been made out.

- **Delhi High Court in Narain Singh V/s. The State (1986 (1) Crimes 535 at page 537)**

Hon'ble Delhi High Court held that, an offence under any law other than the Indian Penal Code would be non-cognizable in character if it is punishable with imprisonment for less than three years or with fine only. Offences under Secs.184 and 185 of the Act must come under the third category of cases mentioned in Part II of the First Schedule of the Code, i.e. punishable with imprisonment for less than three years and hence non-cognizable and bailable in character.

- **Mehaboob Koya Moideen Versus State, 2011 (2) KerLJ 574**

Whether the Magistrate could take cognizance of offences punishable under Secs.184 and 185 of the Act on a police report following an investigation conducted in violation of Sec. 155(2) of the Code- Sub-sec.(1) of Sec.155 of the Code deals with information regarding commission of a non-cognizable offence given to an officer-in-charge of a police station. Sub-sec. (2) says that no police officer shall investigate a non-cognizable case without the order of a Magistrate having power to try or commit for trial such case. An investigation conducted in violation of the said provision stamps such investigation with illegality? (Para 11.) The above discussion leads me to the conclusion that cognizance taken by the learned Magistrate of offences punishable under Secs. 184 and 185 of the Code on a charge sheet submitted by the police officer after an investigation in violation of Sec. 155(2) of the Code is illegal and for reasons I have stated, the said charge sheet cannot also be deemed to be a complaint as defined under Sec.2(d) of the Code. Cognizance taken being illegal is liable to be quashed.

- **Rishbud and Anr. V/s. State of Delhi (AIR 1955 SC 196) and Kunhumammed V/s. State of Kerala (1981 KLT 50) : (1981 Cri LJ 356 (Ker)).**

In the present case, the police officer notwithstanding that offences under Secs. 184 and 185 of the Act are non-cognizable in character has proceeded to register a case as if the said offences are cognizable in character. Recording of first information relating to a cognizable offence is regulated by Sec.154 of the Code. The expression 'First Information Report' must be understood to mean an information recorded under Sec.154 of the Code and the condition which is a sine qua non for recording First Information is that the information received must relate to the commission of a cognizable offence. In the present case the report of

the police officer only disclosed anon-cognizable offence and hence a First Information Report could not have been registered under Sec.154 of the Code. Instead, after recording substance of the non-cognizable offence in the book maintained in the police station for the purpose, the police officer should have submitted a report to the Magistrate having power to try the case and obtained an order for investigation of the case. On receiving such order, such police officer could by virtue of sub-sec.(3) of Sec.155 of the Code exercise the same powers in respect of investigation (except the power to arrest without warrant) as an officer-in-charge of a police station may exercise in a cognizable case. Thereon he could register a First Information Report under Sec.154 of the Code and investigate the case as in a case involving cognizable offence and submit a final report under Sec. 173(2) of the Code in respect of the non- cognizable offences. Thus, the police officer in this case could have registered a First Information Report and investigated the case relating to the offences punishable under Secs. 184 and/or 185 of the Act only with the order of a Magistrate having power to try the case. Since no such order is obtained, registering of the First Information Report, conducting the investigation, filing of charge- sheet and taking cognizance by the learned Magistrate (of offences under Secs. 184 and 185 of the Act) are illegal.

Due to aforesaid discussion, I am not suppose to take cognizance in chargesheet in Non- Cognizable Offence of Sec 185 of MV Act.

3. Hence, In total, this Court can not take cognizance of this chagesheet of Sec 185 of MV ACT because both this section are Non-Cognizable and barred by Sec 155(2) of CR PC. Hence finally we can say that as per Sec 190, this Court is not in position to take cognizance of this Case. Accordingly following order is passed.

Final Order

(I) The Cognizance of this criminal case is not taken as per Sec 190 of CRPC. The Proceeding against the accused person u/s MV Act S 185 is hereby dropped with liberty to prosecution to take such steps as he deems fit in accordance with law. If any muddamal recovered shall be disposed in accordance with law of Criminal Manual. Vehicle be released to RC book owner. Non Valuable (if any) Muddamal be destroyed.

Pronounced in Opon Court today

2ND ADDL CJM Court DAHOD

Dt : 12/7/2025

W R Malik

2ND ADDL CJM DAHOD GJ01144

MANISHABEN