



2025:KER:29248

Crl.M.C.No.2987/2020

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE G.GIRISH

MONDAY, THE 7TH DAY OF APRIL 2025 / 17TH CHAITHRA, 1947

CRL.MC NO. 2987 OF 2020

AGAINST THE ORDER DATED 29.02.2020 IN CRRP NO.58 OF 2019 OF
III ADDITIONAL SESSIONS COURT, THRISSUR

AGAINST THE ORDER DATED 03.06.2019 IN CRL.M.P.NO.4412 OF 2018
IN CC NO.9 OF 2018 OF THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE COURT,THRISSUR

PETITIONERS/REVISION PETITIONERS/ACCUSED NOS.1 TO 8:

- 1 NAVODAYA KURIES LTD
NEAR AMBAKKADAN JUNCTION, THRISSUR CORPORATION, THRISSUR
TALUK, THRISSUR DISTRICT, REPRESENTED BY ITS CHAIRMAN AND
MANAGING DIRECTOR, JOSE K.FRANCIS, AGED 59, S/O.FRANCIS,
KUTTIKADAN HOUSE, ARISTO ROAD, FATHIMA NAGAR, THRISSUR
DISTRICT - 680 005.
- 2 JOSE K.FRANCIS
AGED 59 YEARS
S/O.FRANCIS, KUTTIKADAN HOUSE, ARISTO ROAD, FATHIMA NAGAR,
THRISSUR DISTRICT -680 005.
- 3 THOMAS K.DAVIS
AGED 55 YEARS
S/O.DAVIS, KALLOKARAN HOUSE, LITTLE FLOWER ROAD, NEAR
AMBAKKADAN JUNCTION, THRISSUR, DIRECTOR NAVODAYA KURIES
LTD., NEAR AMBAKKADAN JUNCTION, THRISSUR CORPORATION,
THRISSUR TALUK, THRISSUR DISTRICT - 680 022.
- 4 N.I.KUNJUPAVVU
AGED 55 YEARS
S/O.EYAPPEN, NELLISSERRY HOUSE, ARANATTUKARA DESOM, DIRECTOR
NAVODAYA KURIES LTD., NEAR AMBAKKADAN JUNCTION, THRISSUR
CORPORATION, THRISSUR TALUK, THRISSUR DISTRICT - 680 022.
- 5 ANTO APPADAN
AGED 61 YEARS
S/O.ENASU, DIRECTOR NAVODAYA KURIES LTD., NEAR AMBAKKADAN
JUNCTION, THRISSUR CORPORATION, THRISSUR TALUK, THRISSUR
DISTRICT -680022.



2025:KER:29248

Crl.M.C.No.2987/2020

2

- 6 SIMON K.FRANCIS
 AGED 55 YEARS
 S/O.FRANCIS, KUTTIKADAN HOUSE, EAST FORT, THRISSUR, DIRECTOR
 NADODAYA KURIES LTD., NEAR AMBAKKADAN JUNCTION, THRISSUR
 CORPORATION, THRISSUR TALUK, THRISSUR DISTRICT - 680022.
- 7 SALINI SHIJU
 AGED 37 YEARS
 W/O.SHIJU, OFFICE STAFF, NAVODAYA KURIES LTD., NEAR
 AMBAKKADAN JUNCTION, THRISSUR CORPORATION, THRISSUR TALUK,
 THRISSUR DISTRICT - 680 022.
- 8 SHIBINI KUNJIPAVU
 AGED 53 YEARS
 W/O.KUNJIPAVU, NELLISSERY HOUSE, THRISSUR DISTRICT - 680
 005.

BY ADV G.SREEKUMAR (CHELUR)

RESPONDENTS/RESPONDENTS/RESPONDENTS/STATE OF KERALA AND THE
COMPLAINANT:

- 1 THE STATE OF KERALA
 THROUGH THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR, HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT
 ERNAKULAM DISTRICT - 682018.
- 2 JINU AJITH
 AGED 32, W/O.AJITH ANTO, ARAKKAL HOUSE, NO.1A, FIRST FLOOR,
 PARK LAND APARTMENTS, AMBAKKADAN JUNCTION, CHEMBUKAVU,
 REPRESENTED BY HIS POWER OF ATTORNEY HOLDER, BABU,
 S/O.ANTHAPPAN, VITHAYATHIL HOUSE, DINHA ROAD, NELLIKUNNU,
 THRISSUR DISTRICT - 680 005.

BY ADVS.
SRI.N.M.MADHU FOR R2
SRI.P.P.HARRIS
SRI.SEETHA.S, SR.PUBLIC PROSECUTOR

THIS CRIMINAL MISC. CASE HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON
02.04.2025, THE COURT ON 07.04.2025 PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

**ORDER**

The accused Nos. 1 to 8 in C.C.No.9/2018 on the files of the Chief Judicial Magistrate Court, Thrissur, have filed this petition under Section 482 Cr.PC, challenging the order of dismissal of Crl.R.P.No.58/2019 by the Additional Sessions Court-III, Thrissur. The aforesaid criminal revision petition was filed by the petitioners against the order passed by the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Thrissur, on 31.08.2019 in C.M.P.No.4412/2018 declining the request of the petitioners to discharge them under Section 245(2) Cr.PC.

2. The allegation against the petitioners is that they committed the offences punishable under Sections 406, 420, 465, 468 471 & 120B I.P.C read with Section 34 I.P.C. The allegation against the petitioners is that the company which the petitioners represent had agreed to buy back shares held by the complainant and to pay the value to him as per the undertaking of the second petitioner. It is stated that blank share transfer forms, along with share certificates, were handed over to the second petitioner as requested by him. The petitioners allegedly forged blank share transfer forms so obtained from the complainant/second respondent. It is stated that the seventh petitioner transferred the



shares of the complainant/second respondent in favour of the the eighth petitioner as per the directions of the petitioners 2 to 6.

3. The Police, after investigation, filed a refer-report in the case as one of 'civil nature'. The protest complaint filed by the second respondent against the above refer-report, was taken into files as C.C.No.9/2018 by the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate after the completion of the necessary enquiry under Section 202 Cr.PC. Thereupon, the petitioners filed C.M.P.No.4412/2018 for discharge under Section 245(2) Cr.PC. The learned Magistrate, after hearing both sides, held that there is no reason to find the charge against the petitioners as groundless, and hence declined to allow the prayer of the petitioners to discharge them. The learned Additional Sessions Judge-III, Thrissur, concurred with the findings of the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate and declined to interfere with the order passed by the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, dismissing C.M.P.No.4412/2018 filed by the petitioners. It is the above order of the learned Additional Sessions Judge-III, Thrissur, which is under challenge in the present petition filed by the petitioners under Section 482 Cr.PC. According to the petitioners, the courts below failed to analyse the protest complaint



as an objection to the refer report, and instead, were swayed away by the merits of the inquiry under Section 202 Cr.PC. conducted on the protest complaint.

4. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners, the learned counsel for the second respondent/de facto complainant and the learned Public Prosecutor representing the State of Kerala.

5. After referring to Section 245 Cr.PC, the learned Additional Sessions Judge held in the impugned order that the discharge as envisaged under Sub-Section (2) of Section 245 Cr.PC could be resorted to only in a case where it is found that the charge is groundless. The learned Additional Sessions Judge further observed in the impugned order that, since Section 245(2) covers stages prior to tendering evidence under Section 244 Cr.PC, the material which the Magistrate has to consider to come to a finding as to whether the charge is groundless or not, is the complaint and the material placed before the court during enquiry under Section 202 Cr.PC. According to the learned Additional Sessions Judge, there were specific averments in the complaint regarding the offences of criminal conspiracy, forgery, cheating and dishonestly inducing delivery of property and criminal breach of trust.



Thus, according to the learned Additional Sessions Judge, since the ingredients of the offences taken cognizance of are prima facie made out, it cannot be said that the charge is groundless. It is for the above reasoning that the learned Additional Sessions Judge declined to interfere with the order of the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate dismissing the petition filed by the petitioners for discharge under Section 245(2) Cr.PC. There is absolutely no anomaly or irregularity in the above findings of the learned Additional Sessions Judge, warranting interference in a proceeding under Section 482 Cr.PC. After the completion of the evidence under Section 244 Cr.PC, the petitioners could very well seek their discharge under Section 245(1) Cr.PC, if no case has been made out which, if unrebutted, would warrant their conviction. As regards the contention of the petitioners that the courts below failed to look into the protest complaint in the context of objection to the refer report, it has to be stated that the petitioners could very well challenge the allegations in the protest complaint by referring to the contrary findings in the refer report at the appropriate stages in the further course of proceedings of this case. Therefore, the



2025:KER:29248

CrI.M.C.No.2987/2020

7

prayer in this petition to quash the above order passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, cannot be allowed.

In the result, the petition is hereby dismissed.

(Sd/-)
G. GIRISH, JUDGE

jsr



2025:KER:29248

Crl.M.C.No.2987/2020

8

APPENDIX OF CRL.MC 2987/2020

PETITIONER ANNEXURES

- ANNEXURE I A TRUE COPY OF THE REFER REPORT IN CRIME NO.241 OF 17 OF THE THRISSUR TOWN EAST POLICE STATION DATED 28/2/2017.
- ANNEXURE II A TRUE COPY OF THE PROTEST COMPLAINT FILED BY THE SECOND RESPONDENT DATED 15/10/2016 BEFORE THE C J M, THRISSUR.
- ANNEXURE III A TRUE COPY OF THE APPLICATION FILED BY THE PETITIONERS AS CMP NO.4412 OF 18 IN CC NO.9 OF 18 BEFORE THE CJM, THRISSUR DATED 10/5/2018.
- ANNEXURE IV A TRUE COPY OF THE OBJECTION FILED BY THE SECOND RESPONDENT TO ANNEXURE-III DATED 22/9/2018.
- ANNEXURE V A TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER PASSED IN CMP NO.4412 OF 2018 DATED 31/8/19 BEFORE THE CJM, THRISSUR.
- ANNEXURE VI A TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER PASSED IN CR.RP NO.58 OF 19 DATED 29/2/20 BY THE 3RD ADDL. SESSIONS COURT, THRISSUR.