

ORDER BELOW EXH.1

(1) Heard. Perused the paper's on record. In this case, investigating police officer has filed charge sheet against the accused under section 188 of IPC on the basis of FIR lodged against the accused under the same section. It is alleged in the complaint that accused had violated the terms of promulgation issued by the Commissioner, so he has committed the crime under section 188 of IPC. At this juncture, it is necessary to see the provision of Section 195 of Cri.P.C which provides that no Court shall take cognizance of offence punishable under sections 172 to 188 of Indian Penal Code except on the complaint in writing of the public servant concerned or of some other public servant to whom he is administratively subordinate.

(2) In **Daulat Ram v/s. State of Punjab, 1962 AIR 1206, Hon'ble Supreme Court described the scope of Section 195 Cr.P.C. and held that as per section 195 Cr.P.C.** Complaint must be in writing by the public servant concerned and if there is no compliance of this section then the trial was without jurisdiction and the conviction can not be maintained.

(3) In **Gaurishanker Jha v/s. Chintanath Jha**, Hon'ble Patna High Court has held that if it appears that when the cognizance has been taken and the defect of want of jurisdiction or absence of sanction crops up, then the court should not proceed with the trial. If witnesses have been produced by both sides, when a court has no jurisdiction or there is inherent want of sanction, the prosecution becomes bad, illegal and without jurisdiction.....All proceeding are to be dropped or complaint has to be dismissed but definitely no order of acquittal or discharge can be passed.

(4) In **Kanjibhai v/s. State on 16 March, 2010. Criminal Misc. Application no.348 of 1995**, Hon'ble Gujarat High Court held in para 7 that, in view of the provisions of sub-section(1) of section-195, which expressly bars taking of cognizance of an offence under section-188 except as provided thereunder, read with section-2(d) of the Code, it was not permissible for the learned Judicial Magistrate First Class to take cognizance of the offence in question on the basis of a charge-sheet filed pursuant to the first information report lodged by the respondent No.2. In the light of the provisions of section 195(1) (a), the Court could not have taken cognizance of the offence under section 188 IPC except on a complaint in writing by the public servant concerned or some other public servant to whom he is administatively subordinate.

(5) In **Arvind Kejriwal & Ors. v/s. Amit Sibal & Anr.,**

Cri.Misc.Application no.18920-21/2013. it was held by Hon'ble Delhi High Court that, If the trial court proceeds to drop the proceedings qua petitioners, then the Apex Court's decision in Adalat prasad v/s. Rooplal Jindal and Ors. (2004) 7 SCC 338 would not stand in the way of trial court to do so.

(6) As per the above discussion, if as per law the court has no power to take cognizance and cognizance if taken then to proceed with the matter and to convict or acquit the accused in spite of lack of jurisdiction is bad in law. In the similar way, if accused is acquitted or discharged on the basis of the ground that Court has no jurisdiction to take cognizance then this will curtail the right of prosecution to file fresh proceedings as per procedure prescribed by law. In view of this to proceed with this matter is not justified by law. Hence, following order is passed is passed in the interest of justice.

O R D E R

The Proceeding against accused person u/s 188 of IPC is ordered to be dropped without going into the merits of this case with liberty to prosecution to take such steps as deems fit in accordance with law.

I.O to take necessary action for the disposal of muddamal as per law / Interim Order if any, passed by the Court in respect of muddamal is ordered to be made absolute.

Pronounce in the open Court today on this 10th day of July, 2021 in Special Sitting of the Lok-Adalat.

(Manish V. Chauhan)

GJ01015

10th Add. Chief Judi. Magistrate
Rajkot.