

Criminal Case NO.:45867/2021

IPC S.188 The Epidemic Disease Act s. 3

ORDER BELOW EXH.1

(1) Heard both side advocates and perused the record of this case. In this case investigating police officer filed charge sheet against accused under section 188 IPC on the basis of FIR lodged against the accused. On perusing the record police filed charge sheet on the ground that accused violated the terms of promulgation issued by Commissioner so he committed the crime under section 188 of IPC. In section 195 Cr.P.C. It is clearly mentioned 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 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 proceedings 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 administratively 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 if 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 it is not justified by law, to proceed with this matter. Hence the following order is passed.

It is hereby ordered to drop the proceedings against the accused without going on the merits of this case, hence disposed of.

Date: 11/12/2021

Place: Rajkot

3rd Addl. Chief Judi. Magistrate,
R A J K O T