

Cr.P.C. Case Laws

Important judgments of Criminal Procedure Code

-By Adv. Abhishek Gupta
(Delhi High Court)

Mobile: **9999052336**/ 8700521407
E-mail: adv.abhishek3995@gmail.com

- Success

Serial No.	Case Title	Held
1.	The State of Bihar V. Chandra Bhushan Singh & Ors. AIR 2001 Supreme Court 429	Section 2(d) Charge sheet by RPF officer for offence under Railway Property Act can be treated as complaint of the RPF.
2.	Attiq-Ur-Rehman V. Municipal Corporation of Delhi and Another AIR 1996 SC 1267	Section 4 In absence of special court the regular court can try the offence.
3.	Thomas Dana V. The State of Punjab AIR 1959 SC 375	Section 4 The words Punishment and Penalty is explained.
4.	Republic of Italy thr. Ambassador & Ors. V. Union of India (UOI) and Ors. 2013(1) SCALE 462	Section 4 Union Govt. was directed to constitute special court.
5.	Pankajbhai Nagjibhai Patel V. The State of Gujarat and Anr. AIR 2001 SC 567	Section 4(2) When the special statute does not prescribe procedure Cr.P.C. is applicable.
6.	Re. Sikandar khan Mahomed khan 1920 (22) BOM LR 200	Section 9 Additional Sessions Judge can hear appeal.
7.	Emperor V. Lakshman Chavji Narangikar AIR 1931 Bom 313	Section 9(3) 194 and 409 Assistant and Additional Sessions Judges exercise jurisdiction of Sessions Court but they are separate Courts.
8.	Praphakar V. The State of Maharashtra 2012 Cri.L.J. 4726	Section 28 Assistant Sessions Judge should not be allotted with case punishable with more than 10 years.
9.	Pankajbhai Nagjibhai Patel V. The State Of Gujarat AIR 2001 SC 567	Section 29 and Section 138 NI Act Magistrate has no pecuniary limit for compensation.
10.	Pankajbhai Nagjibhai Patel V. The State Of Gujarat AIR 2001 SC 567	Section 29 Magistrate has no pecuniary limit for compensation.

11.	Shidlingappa Gurulingappa V. Emperor AIR 1926 Bom 416	Section 31 Aggregate fine should be considered for the purpose of appeal.
12.	Chatar Singh V. State Of M.P. AIR 2007 SC 319	Section 31 Aggregate sentence not to exceed 14 years when consecutive SC says.
13.	Hariom @ Kalicharan Shiriram and anr. V. The State of Maharashtra 1994(2) Bom C.R.219	Section 31 and 427(1) Accused convicted in 3 cases His sentence of 22 years brought down by giving concurrence in two cases.
14.	Emperor V. Piru Rama Havaladar 27 BOM LR 1371	Section 31 and IPC Section 71 separate sentences are subject to the provisions of Section 71, Indian Penal Code.
15.	Jagat Bahadur Singh Jagat Bahadur Singh V. State of Madhya Pradesh AIR 1966 SC 945	Section 31 Appellate court can inflict the Trial Court's limited punishment only.
16.	Reg. V. Tukaya Bin Tamana ILR 1875 1 Bom 214	Section 31 For Section 457 and 380 IPC Sentence may be either for both or for one but should not greater.
17.	Sunil Anandrao Sawant V. Government Of Maharashtra 2010 Cri.L.J. 3579	Section 31 Separate sentence to run consecutive after life has been discussed.
18.	Nanak Chand V. The State of Punjab AIR 1955 SC 274	Section 34 and 149 Distinction is Explained.
19.	D.K. Basu V. State of West Bengal AIR 1997 SC 610	Section 41 and Constitution Article 21 Directions with respect to arrest and detention.
20.	R.P. Vaghela V. State of Gujarat 2002 Cri.L.J. 3082	Section 41 and Contempt of Courts Act Section 10 Mere handcuffing without prior permission, in justifiable circumstances does not amount to contempt.

21.	Afak Shabbir Khan V. The State Of Maharashtra & Anr 2013 Bom CR(Cri) 242(DB)	Section 41 Mentioning reasons in the arrest panchanama is held sufficient compliance of recording reasons for arrest.
22.	Arnesh Kumar V. State of Bihar AIR 2014 SC 2756	Section 41(1) and 41A and Section 498-A of IPC Directions to police and Magistrates.
23.	Manikandan V. S. I. of Police, Nallalam Police Stn 2008 Cri.L.J. 1338	Section 41(1)(d) Accused needs to be bailed or not is discussed.
24.	Joginder Kumar V. State of U.P. and Ors. (1994) 4 SCC 260	Section 56(1) Magistrate to ensure compliance of directions given.
25.	Jayendragiri Anandgiri Goswami V. Narcotics Control Bureau and Anr. 2005 Cri.L.J. 3190	Section 57 Accused in NCB custody arrested in another crime should be produced before magistrate within 24 hours.
26.	Gajanan P. Lasure V. The Director General of Police & ors. 2009(4) Mh.L.J.399	Section 57 and deemed suspension of accused public servant.
27.	Raghuvansh Dewanchand Bhasin V. State of Maharashtra and Anr AIR 2011 SC 3393	Section 70 and 71 No Arrest on cancelled warrant. Warrant register be maintained.
28.	State Through CBI V. Dawood Ibrahim Kaskar AIR 1997 SC 2494	Section 73 Warrant can be issued before charge sheet and for investigation purpose.
29.	Shaikh Raheman V. State of Maharashtra 1991(1) Bom.CR. 263	Section 79 Magistrate can issue warrant for execution beyond his local jurisdiction.
30.	M.P. Sharma and Ors. V. Satish Chandra AIR 1954 SC 300	Section 93 and 94 Search and Seizure from accused not violative of fundamental rights.
31.	State of Gujarat V. Shyamlal Mohanlal Choksi MANU-SC-0383-1964	Section 94 is not applicable to accused.

32.	State of Gujarat V. Shyamlal Mohanlal Choksi AIR 1965 SC 1251	Section 94(1) Power to issue summons to produce document is not applicable to accused.
33.	Pravin Singh and another V. Biharilal Singh and another 1989 Cri.L.J. (1386) (Bom)	Section 97 Search can be conducted in a place other than mentioned in warrant.
34.	State Govt. of NCT of Delhi V. Sunil and Another 2001 Cri.L.J. 504	Section 100 and Section 27 Evidence Act Witnesses not required.
35.	Khet Singh V. Union of India (UOI) AIR 2002 SC 1450	Section 100 Seizure panchanama prepared at customs office instead of spot did not cause prejudice Hence relied.
36.	State Of Maharashtra & Ors. V. Sudhir Vasant Karnataki Etc. MANU-SCOR- 47069-2014	Section 100 Whether immovable property is included or not referred to larger bench.
37.	State Govt. of NCT of Delhi V. Sunil and Another 2001 Cri.L.J. 504	Section 100(5) and Evidence Act Section 27 Witnesses is not required.
38.	Sudhir Vasant Karnataki V. The State of Maharashtra 2011 (1) Bom.C.R. (Cri.) 326 _ 2011 ALL MR (Cri) 96	Section 102 (1) Property does not include immovable property.
39.	Sunder Singh V. State Of Uttar Pradesh AIR 1956 SC 411	Section 103 Applicable to search of a place and not of a person. Hence, independent witnesses not necessary.
40.	Suresh Nanda V. C.B.I., AIR 2008 SC 1414	Section 104 Passport can be impounded by Passport Authority and not by Police.
41.	The State of Maharashtra and Anr V. Mangali Dewaiyya Pupalla 1994 Mh.L.J. 483	Section 107 and 116 No provision to ask for interim bond.

42.	Rajesh Suryabhan Nayak V. The State of Maharashtra 2006(5)Mh.L.J. 243	Section 107 and 123 No interim bond and C.J.M reduced bond.
43.	Pramila Navin Shah V. State of Maharashtra & Ors 2005(15) Criminal. CC. 1051	Section 107 No provision to ask for interim bond.
44.	Dattatraya Mahadu Tikkal V. The State of Maharashtra 2014(1) Bom.C.R.(Cri) 439	Section 107 Sessions Judge has to interfere if action is illegal.
45.	Pravin Vijaykumar Taware V. The Special Executive Magistrate 2009 (111) BOM.L.R. 3166	Section 116 Training to Executive Magistrates directed by High Court.
46.	Allabuksh Karim Shaikh V. Smt. Noorjahan Allabuksh Shaikh And Another 1994Mh.L.J. 1376	Section 125 application for muslim child is tenable.
47.	Smt. Saroj Govind Mukkawar V. Smt. Chandrakalabai Polshetwar 2009(4) Mh.L.J. 665	Section 125 Daughter in law was directed to maintain mother in law.
48.	Nandlal Wasudeo Badwaik V. Lata Nandlal Badwaik and Anr. AIR 2014 SC 932	Section 125 DNA Test prevails over the presumption.
49.	Bakulabai and Anr. V. Gangaram and Anr. (1988) 1 SCC 537	Section 125 Illegitimate child is entitled for maintenance.
50.	Jaiminiben Hirenghai Vyas V. Hirenghai Rameshchandra Vyas Decided On- 19.11.2014	Section 125 Judgment shall contain reasons for finding for grant of maintenance from the date of application.
51.	Jagdish Jugtawat V. Manju Lata and Ors. (2002)5 SCC 422	Section 125 Maintenance by Family Court to major daughter was upheld.

52.	Shivaji Baburao Bhabad @ Bhawad V. Sau. Alka Shivaji Bhabad Crl. W. Petition No. 955 of 2009	Section 125 Major son is not entitled for maintenance.
53.	Jagir Singh V. Ranbir Singh and Anr. AIR 1979 SC 381	Section 125 Major son though student is not entitled for maintenance from father.
54.	Chinnappaiyan Chellandi V. Chinnathayee Chinnappaiyan 2010(1) Crimes 835	Section 125 Permission granted to amend petition.
55.	Sau. Manda R. Thaore V. Sh. Ramaji Ghanshyam Thaore Crl. Revision Application No. 317- 2006 Decided On- 20.04.2010	Section 125 Second wives maintenance rejected but compensation granted in revision.
56.	Dalip Singh V. Rajbala II (2007) DMC 273	Section 125 (4) Adultery not applicable to divorcee.
57.	Gita V. Chandrasekhar	Section 125(4) Divorced on cruelty ground is till entitled for maintenance.
58.	M. Chinna Karuppasamy V. Kanimozhi 2015 ALL M R (Cri)615	Section 125(4) includes adultery by divorced wife.
59.	Chanda Preetam Wadate V. Preetam Ganpatrao Wadate 2002(2) Mh.L.J. 482	Section 125(4) Isolated instance of adultery is not sufficient to deny maintenance.
60.	Vanamala (Smt) V. H.M. Ranganatha Bhatta (1995) 5 SCC 299	Section 125(4) Wife does not include Divorcee.
61.	Ashok Yeshwant Samant V. Smt. Suparna Ashok Samant and another 1991 Cri.L.J. 766	Section 127(1) Precondition to deposit arrears cannot be put.
62.	Ahmed Noormohmed Bhatti V. State of Gujarat and Ors. AIR 2005 SC 2115	Section 151 is not ultravires merely because it can be misused.

63.	Anju Chaudhary V. State of U.P. and Anr. 2013 Cri.L.J. 776	Section 154 and 156(3) If the offence is same there cannot be two FIRs. Magistrate can treat application as a complaint.
64.	Satvinder Kaur V. State (Govt. of N.C.T. of Delhi) AIR 1999 SC 3596	Section 154 and 177 The IO can forward the FIR to the police station having jurisdiction if the offence was beyond own Jurisdiction.
65.	Ushaben V. Kishorbhai Chunilal Talpada & Ors. 2012 ACR 1859	Section 154 and 198A Police can investigate Section 494 with 498A of IPC as Section 498A is cognizable.
66.	Ganesh V. Sharanappa and anr. AIR 2014 SC 1198	Section 154 and 354 The person who lodges the FIR be called the Informant and not the Complainant.
67.	M. Narayandas V. State Of Karnataka And Ors. 2004 Cri.L.J. 822	Section 154 FIR reasonableness or Credibility of the said information is not a condition precedent for registration of a case.
68.	Babubhai V. State of Gujarat and Ors. (2010) 12 SCC 254	Section 154 For deciding tenability of two FIRs sameness test should be applied.
69.	Ashi Devi and Ors. V. State (NCT of Delhi) MANU-SC-0526-2014	Section 154 In a 9 years old theft case held that mere delay itself is not a ground to discard a case.
70.	Gosu Jayarami Reddy V. State of A.P. (2011) 11 SCC 766	Section 154 Overwriting limited to converting 4 to 5 in FIR is immaterial.
71.	Satvinder Kaur V. State (Govt. of N.C.T. of Delhi) AIR 1999 SC 3596	Section 154 and 177 The IO can forward the FIR to the police station having jurisdiction if the offence was beyond own Jurisdiction
72.	Ganesh V. Sharanappa and anr. 2014 (11) SCALE 541	Section 154 Person who lodges FIR is called Informant and who files complaint is called complainant.

73.	Mrs. Charu Kishor Mehta and etc. V. State of Maharashtra and Anr. 2011 Cri.L.J. 1486	Section 154 Police cannot refuse to register the F.I.R. under the pretext of preliminary inquiry when cognizable offences are made Out.
74.	Lalita Kumari V. Govt. of U.P. and Ors. 2014 Cri.L.J. 470	Section 154 Police is bound to register F.I.R.
75.	Satish Narayan Sawant V. State of Goa 2009 Cri.L.J. 4655	Section 154 police officer going to the place of occurrence to make some survey does not amount to making an investigation doc.
76.	Mrs. Charu Kishor Mehta V. State of Maharashtra and Adtl. Commissioner of Police Decided in- November 2010	Section 154 Police shall register FIR instead of ignoring as civil dispute.
77.	Sone Lal & Ors. Case AIR 1978 SC 1142	Section 154 Recording FIR is an official act and has such presumption.
78.	Mrs. Charu Kishor Mehta and etc. V. State of Maharashtra and Anr. 2011 Cri.L.J. 1486	Section 154 Reliability genuineness and credibility of the information are not the conditions precedent.
79.	M. Narayandas V. State Of Karnataka And Ors. 2004 Cri.L.J. 822	Section 154, Sections 195 and 340 do not come in the way of investigation by police. On the basis of such investigation the Court can file a complaint.
80.	Surender Kaushik and Ors. V. State of Uttar Pradesh and Ors. AIR 2013 SC 3614	Section 154 There cannot be two FIRs of the same person of same incident.
81.	Surender Kaushik and Ors. V. State of Uttar Pradesh and Ors. AIR 2013 SC 3614	Section 154 When a FIR is already there sameness test shall be used for the subsequent FIRs.
82.	State Of Haryana And Ors V. Ch. Bhajan Lal And Ors. 1992 AIR 604	Section 154 When can the Court pass appropriate orders.

83.	Satish Narayan Sawant V. State of Goa 2009 Cri.L.J. 4655	Section 154 When information was cryptic the police officer going to the place of occurrence to make some survey is not an investigation.
84.	Pravin Chandra Mody V. State of Andhra Pradesh AIR 1965 SC 1185	Section 155 Police can investigate a non- cognizable offence under EC Act along with Section 420 IPC.
85.	Dashrath Kishan Kotkar and Anr. V. State of Maharashtra 1986 Mh.L.J. 986	Section 155(2) and (3) Once permission is obtained the procedure applicable to cognazable offences is applicable.
86.	Vithal Puna Koli (Shirsath) and Ors. V. The State of Maharashtra MH-0633-2006	Section 155(2) Obtaining Magistrate's permission is necessary.
87.	State of Maharashtra V. Dharmendra Ambar Mohite (10.09.1998 – BOM.HC)	Section 155(2) permission was not obtained Hence prosecution for offence of Section 145 Police Act was held untenable.
88.	Mukhedkar V. The State of Maharashtra, 1983 Cri.L.J. 1833	Section 155(2) Prosecution for Section 124 of Bom Police Act quashed for want of permission Avinash Madhukar.
89.	Shivaji Vithalrao Bhikane V. Chandrasen Jagdevrao Deshmuk 2008 Cri.L.J. 376	Section 156 and 397 156(3) of Cr.PC merely mean that an alleged cognizable offence should be investigated.
90.	Atul Son of Shridhar Kaple V. State of Maharashtra, thr. Police Station Officer 2011 113 BOM.L.R. 1549	Section 156 Section 173(3) and Section 190(1)(c).
91.	Pravin Chandra Mody V. State of Andhra Pradesh AIR 1965 SC 1185	Section 156(1) and 173 Police officer can investigate E.C. Act offence along with Section 420.
92.	Sheshrao and Ors. V. The State of Maharashtra and Ors. Decided on 24.07.2015	Section 156(1) Charge sheet quashed for want of jurisdiction.

93.	Satvinder Kaur V. State (1999) 8 SCC 728	Section 156(2) Police can investigate any cognizable offence and to submit charge sheet before competent court.
94.	Alpic Finance Ltd. V. P. Sadasivan and Anr. AIR 2001 SC 1226	Section 156(3) and IPC Section 420 It must also be shown that there existed a fraudulent and dishonest intention at the time of commission of the offence.
95.	Vinay Tyagi V. Irshad Ali @ Deepak and Ors. 2013 Cri.L.J. 754	Section 156(3) and 173(8) Kinds of order under Section 156(3) are (i) Initial Investigation, (ii) Further Investigation, (iii) Fresh or de novo or re-investigation-Detail.
96.	Gopal Das Sindhi and Ors. V. The State of Assam and Anr. 1961 Cri.L.J. 39(3JJs)	Section 156(3) and 190 Passing order of Section 156(3) or Search Warrant is not taking Cognizance.
97.	Gopal Das Sindhi and Ors. V. The State of Assam and Anr. 1961 Cri.L.J. 39	Section 156(3) and 190 Taking Cognizance on complaint means verification etc.
98.	Nirmaljit Singh Hoon V. The State of West Bengal AIR 1972 SC 2639	Section 156(3) and 200 Cognizance means not mere applying mind but for the purpose of proceeding under Section 200 and following Provisions.
99.	Sachin V. The State of Maharashtra 2014 ALL.M.R (Cri)1833	Section 156(3) and 200 Magistrate has discretion to reject the prayer and direct for verification etc.
100.	Ramdev Food Products Pvt. Ltd V. State of Gujarat 2015 (3) SCALE 622	Section 156(3) and 202 No arrest in investigation of Section 202.
101.	Raghu Raj Singh Rousha V. Shivam Sundaram Promoters (2009) 2 SCC 363	Section 156(3) and 397 Accused shall be impleaded in a revision against order refusing Section 156.
102.	Shivaji Vithalrao Bhikane V. Chandrasen Jagdevrao Deshmuk 2008 Cri.L.J. 3761	Section 156(3) and 398 Interference in should be in exceptional cases.

103.	Syed Muzaffaruddin Khan Mohd. V. Mohd.Abdul Qadir Mohd. Abdul 2012 Bom C R(Cri) 375	Section 156(3) and Section 195 and Section 341 Magistrate can order Section 156(3) and after investigation he can file complaint.
104.	Shivaji Vithalrao Bhikane V. Chandrasen Jagdevrao Deshmukh 2008 Cri.L.J. 3761	Section 156(3) and Section 397 Direction by sessions judge for sending signature to the expert set aside.
105.	Chandrika Singh V. State of U.P. 2007 Cri.L.J. 3169	Section 156(3) application can be treated as complaint.
106.	Mrs. Priyanka Srivastava & Anr. V. State of UP & Ors 2015 (96) SCC 287	Section 156(3) Application should be supported by affidavit.
107.	Shivaji Vithalrao Bhikane V. Chandrasen Jagdevrao Deshmukh 2008 Cri.L.J. 3761	Section 156(3) Before the order complainant cannot be asked to call expert to prove forgery.
108.	Mohd. Yousuf V. Smt. Afaq Jahan and Anr. AIR 2006 SC 705	Section 156(3) Complainant should not be examined before order under this section.
109.	Srinivas Gundluri and Ors. V. SEPCO (2010) 8 SCC 206	Section 156(3) Difference of Section 156(3) and 202 Cr.P.C. Mere direction to file charge sheet not illegal.
110.	Upkar Singh V. Ved Prakash and Ors. AIR 2004 SC 4320	Section 156(3) Direction to register counter FIR is valid.
111.	Madhubala V. Sureshkumar AIR 1997 SC 3104	Section 156(3) Format of order.
112.	Anju Chaudhary V. State of U.P. and Anr. 2013 Cri.L.J. 776	Section 156(3) Magistrate can treat an application as a complaint In more than one FIRs sameness test has to be applied.
113.	Central Bureau of Investigation through S.P., Jaipur V. State of Rajasthan & Anr. AIR 2001 SC 668	Section 156(3) Magistrate cannot direct the CBI investigation.

114.	K. Selvaraj V. The Superintendent of Police and The Inspector of Police	Section 156(3) Magistrate cannot order investigation by the CBI.
115.	Sachin Raosaheb Jadhav V. State of Maharashtra Justice Nalawade	Section 156(3) Magistrate has discretion not to refer to police and to inquire himself into the application.
116.	Sukhwasi S/o Hulasi V. State of Uttar Pradesh 2008 Cri.L.J. 472	Section 156(3) Magistrate has discretion to send or not to send for investigation.
117.	Nilesh Daulatrao Lakhani V. State of Maharashtra 2014(4) Bom CR (Cri) 757	Section 156(3) No cognizance on police report after first directing for inquiry.
118.	R.P. Kapur V. S.P. Singh AIR 1961 SC 1117	Section 156(3) No order to CBI by Magistrate.
119.	Blue Dart Express Ltd. V. The State of Maharashtra 2011(2) Crimes 46	Section 156(3) order after verification was set aside and directed to proceed.
120.	Yogiraj Vasant Rao Surve V. State of Maharashtra 2013 ALL.M.R. (Cri) 2059	Section 156(3) order can be challenged in Revision.
121.	R.R. Chari V. The State of Uttar Pradesh AIR 1951 SC 207	Section 156(3) Order does not amount to taking cognizance 3 Judges Bench.
122.	Basanthi Sarkar and Ors. V. State of West Bengal and Ors. MANU-WB-0218-2010	Section 156(3) order in Section 193 IPC offence upheld by Kolkata HC.
123.	General Officer Commanding V. CBI and Anr. AIR 2012 SC 1890	Section 156(3) order is not taking Cognizance.
124.	Shivaji Vithalrao Bhikane V. Chandrasen 2008 Cri.L.J. 3761	Section 156(3) Orders interference by superior Courts normally be in very exceptional circumstances.

125.	Ajit Ramrao Thete and others V. The State of Maharashtra and another Bombay (DB)	Section 156(3) Original Complaint and order should be retained in Court.
126.	Mohd. Yousuf V. Smt. Afaq Jahan and Anr. 2006(1) KLJ380	Section 156(3) Petition's Format and nomenclature is not material It can be treated as complaint.
127.	Samaj Parivartan Samudaya and Ors. V. State of Karnataka and Ors. AIR 2012 SC 2326	Section 156(3) Police investigation may start with registration of FIR while in other cases (CBI, etc.), an inquiry may lead to registration of an FIR.
128.	Laxminarayan Vishwanath Arya V. The State of Maharashtra through Senior Inspector of Police and Ors. 2008 Cri.L.J. 1	Section 156(3) Police need not seek permission of Magistrate to arrest accused.
129.	Raghu Raj Singh Rousha V. Shivam Sundaram Promoters (P) L and Anr. (2009) 2 SCC 363	Section 156(3) Refusing direction for investigation and direction for verification and statements is taking cognizance.
130.	Karnataka HC Sri. B.V. Acharya, V. Sri. N. Venkateshaiah	Section 156(3) Sanction needed for even order under section.
131.	Mr. Panchabhai Popotbhai Butani, V. The State of Maharashtra 2010 Cri.L.J. 2723	Section 156(3) Simplicitor application without FIR is tenable.
132.	Pinni Co-op Housing Society and others Maruti Mathu Gaikwad and others Bom DB dd on 02.07.2013 CR. APPLN 463510	Section 156(3) This section cannot be resorted to after direction to put up for verification.
133.	Sakiri Vasu V. State of U.P. and Ors. AIR 2008 SC 907	Section 156(3) When can Magistrate Monitor investigation.
134.	Maksud Saiyed V. State of Gujarat and Ors. (2008) 5 SCC 668	Section 156(3) While passing the order the Magistrate has to apply mind.

135.	Rasiklal Dalpatram Thakkar V. State of Gujarat and Ors. AIR 2010 SC 715	Section 156(5) and 181(4) Jurisdiction to be of the JMFC and not of the PSO.
136.	Mr. Panchabhai Popotbhai Butani V. The State of Maharashtra 2010 Cri.L.J. 2723	Section 156(6) Application without prior F.I.R. tenable.
137.	State rep. by Inspector of Police, Vigilance and Anti-Corruption, Tiruchirapalli, Tamil Nadu V. V. Jayapaul (22.03.2004 -SC) (2004)5 SCC 223	Section 157 No statutory bar to the informant-police officer for taking up the investigation.
138.	The State of Uttar Pradesh V. Bhagwant Kishore Joshi AIR 1964 SC 221	Section 157 and PC Act Investigation can be started on information or otherwise means without FIR.
139.	S.N. Sharma V. Bipen Kumar Tiwari and Ors. AIR 1970 SC 786	Section 159 does not enable Magistrate to stop investigation. Gives limited power to Magistrate to direct investigate proceed himself but no power to stop investigation. Meant to give Magistrate the power of directing investigation where the police decide not to investigate the case under the proviso to Section 157(1)
140.	Ashok Debbarma V. State of Tripura (2014) 4 SCC 747	Section 161 and 154 Omission to name accused when he was part of group is not fatal.
141.	State of N.C.T. of Delhi V. Mukesh (2013) 2 SCC 58	Section 161 and 162 and Evi Act Section 145 Statement on TV channel subsequent to charge sheet is not covered Bipin Panchal Distinguished.
142.	Mahesh Janardhan Gonnade Vs. State of Maharashtra (2008) 13 SCC 271	Section 161 and 164 Testimony of I.O. and Spl Judl. Magi. cannot be disbelieved and discredited.

143.	Ashok Debbarma @ Achak Debbarma V. State of Tripura (2014) 4 SCC 747	Section 161 Every omission is not contradiction.
144.	State of Gujarat V. Kathi Ramku Aligbhai 1986 Cri.L.J. 239	Section 161 Inadmissible portions in the panchana should be marked by the APP and excluded by the Juge and How to appreciate Witnesses.
145.	State of U.P. V. M.K. Anthony AIR 1985 SC 48.	Section 161 Signature of witness does not render evidence inadmissible.
146.	Nirpal Singh and Ors. V. State of Haryana AIR 1977 SC 1066	Section 161 Statement of witness need not be there in inquest panchanama.
147.	Gujarat High Court Full Bench Nathu Manchhu V. The State of Gujarat 1978 Cri.L.J. 448	Section 161 Statement reading over to witness does not make his evidence inadmissible.
148.	Suresh V. The State of Maharashtra (DB) Decided on- 31.10.2014	Section 161 Statement should not be read over to the witness by the police.
149.	Md. Ankoos and Ors. V. The Public Prosecutor, High Court of A.P. AIR 2010 SC 566	Section 161(3) Statement cannot be used.
150.	Dr. Sunil Clifford Daniel V. State of Punjab (2012) 11 SCC 205	Section 161 In view of exception of Section 162(2) to Section 161, statement of accused under Section 27 Evidence Act need not be signed by accused.
151.	State of Kerala V. Babu & Ors. AIR1999 SC 2161	Section 162 and 161 and 91 Magistrate can call case diary of another case.

152.	Mr. Prakash Vernekar V. State of Goa 2007 Cri.L.J. 4649	Section 162 and 452 and S.27 not barred for deciding custody of muddemal.
153.	Pakala Narayana Swami V. Emperor AIR 1939 PC 47	Section 162 Any confession made to a police officer in course of investigation whether a discovery is made or not is excluded.
154.	Khatri and Ors. V. State of Bihar and Ors. AIR1981 SC 1068	Section 162 Bar is not applicable in civil or other proceeding.
155.	Ramkishan Mithanlal Sharma V. The State of Bombay AIR 1955 SC 104	Section 162 covers statements to police during TIP.
156.	George & Ors V. State Of Kerala (1998) 4 SCC 605	Section 162 Statement of I.O. in the inquest what he saw is admissible
157.	State of Karnataka by Nonavinakere Police V. Shivanna @ Tarkari Shivanna 2014 (3)BomCR(Cri)98	Section 164 and IPC Section 376 Directions to Police and Magistrates.
158.	The State of Maharashtra V. Prakash Dhawal Khairnar 1997 Bom CR (Cri) 367	Section 164 Confession explained.
159.	Dhananjaya Reddy etc. V. State of Karnataka AIR 2001 SC 1512	Section 164 Confession without signature of accused inadmissible.
160.	Abdul Razak Shaikh V. State of Maharashtra 1987 Mh L J 863	Section 164 Signature of accused is mandatory.
161.	State of Karnataka by Nonavinakere Police V. Shivanna @ Tarkari Shivanna 2014 ALL M R(Cri) 4484 (2014) 8S CC913	Section 164 statement of victim girl should not be disclosed to any person till final report.

162.	State Of Maharashtra V. Sharad B. Sarada 1983 (1) Bom CR 578	Section 167 60th or 90th day though holiday cannot be excluded.
163.	Abdul Wahid V. State of Maharashtra on 27 August 1991	Section 167 After charge sheet bail under Section 436 or 437 only.
164.	Asgar Yusuf Mukadam and Ors. V. State of Maharashtra and The Superintendent of Prison 2004 Cri. L. J. 4312	Section 167 Allowing Home Food is in discretion of Magistrate.
165.	Kum. Shradha Meghshyam Velhal V. State of Maharashtra	Section 167 and 4 and POCSO Act JFCM has no jurisdiction to remand take cognizance and commit under POCSO Act.
166.	State through C.B.I. V. Dawood Ibrahim Kaskar and others AIR 1997 SC 2494	Section 167 and 309 If accused was not arrested till taking cognizance his remand can be granted.
167.	Re. Jakir Khan @ Jaker MANU-WB- 0253-2012	Section 167 and 437 Transit Remand granted by rejecting bail.
168.	Daji Govind Kamble V. State of Maharashtra	Section 167 and Section 36 of NDPS Act Magistrate remanded for more than 15 days.
169.	B.S. Rawat, Asstt. Collector V. Leidomann Heinrich And Another on 20 November, 1990	Section 167 bail in serious offences NDPS can be cancelled.
170.	Bhupinder Singh & Ors V. Jarnail Singh & Anr on 13 July, 2006	Section 167 For Section 304B of IPC 90 days SC Rajeev Chowdhary case referred.
171.	Hitendra Vishnu Thakur V. State of Maharashtra on 12 July, 1994	Section 167 for TADA offences explained.
172.	Mohammed Ajmal Mohammad Amir Kasab V. State of Maharashtra AIR 2012 SC 3565	Section 167 Free legal aid should be provided from the stage of remand.

173.	Khatri And Others V. State Of Bihar AIR 1981 SC 928	Section 167 Free Legal aid to be given at remand stage.
174.	Prasad V. V. State of Kerala ILR 2013 (2) Kerala 1010	Section 167 in POCSO Act offence Magistrate can entertain first remand.
175.	Arnesh Kumar V. State of Bihar AIR 2014 SC 2756	Section 167 in Section 498A IPC the Magistrate authorising detention without recording reasons is liable for departmental action.
176.	Nijamuddin Mohammad Bashir Khan V. State of Maharashtra On 7 July, 2006	Section 167 Limitation is 60 days for 10 years imprisonment.
177.	Khatri And Others V. State Of Bihar 1981 SCC (1) 627	Section 167 Magistrate and Judges shall inform accused about free legal aid.
178.	Harihar Chaitanya V. State Of U.P. 1990 Cri.L.J. 2082	Section 167 Magistrate can differ with the I.O.
179.	Manubhai Ratilal Patel Tr. Ushaben V. State of Gujarat and Ors. AIR 2013 SC 313	Section 167 Magistrate has to look into facts before granting remand.
180.	Khatri And Others V. State Of Bihar 1981 SCC (1) 627	Section 167 Magistrate is under obligation to inform availability of free legal aid Free Legal aid.
181.	State V. Santokh Singh AIR 43 1956 Madhya Pradesh 13	Section 167 No police custody of imprisoned accused.
182.	CBI V. Anupam Kulkarni (1992)3SCC141	Section 167 PCR should be within the first Fifteen days only and that period cannot be extended under any circumstances.

183.	Rajeev Chowdhary case referred Nijamuddin Mohammad Bashir Khan V. State of Maharashtra On 7 July, 2006	Section 167 Period is 60 days for Section 395 and 366 IPC.
184.	Bhupinder Singh & Ors V. Jarnail Singh & Anr on 13 July, 2006	Section 167 Period is 90 days for Section 304B IPC.
185.	Devender Kumar V. State of Haryana 2010 Cri.L.J. 3849	Section 167 Police custody can be in the first 15 days only. Cancellation of bail set aside.
186.	Narain V. Superintendent, Central Jail, New Delhi AIR 1971 SC 178	Section 167 Remand in absence of accused who is not produced from jail is not illegal.
187.	Mr. Uday Mohanlal Acharya V. State of Maharashtra 2001 Cri.L.J. 4563	Section 167 Right to bail is defeated if not availed already.
188.	Arnesh Kumar V. State of Bihar AIR 2014 SC 2756	Section 167 Supreme Court directions regarding arrested accused.
189.	State of WB V. Dinesh Dalmia AIR 2007 SC 1801	Section 167 Surrender is different from production by police.
190.	State of Maharashtra and Ors. V. Saeed Sohail Sheikh etc. AIR 2013 SC 168	Section 167 Transfer of Under prisoners to other jails is subject to Judicial order.
191.	Central Bureau of Investigation V. Rathin Dandapat and Ors. 2015 (9) SCALE 120	Section 167(2) Absconding accused arrested after charge sheet can be remanded to PCR.
192.	Aslam Babalal Desai V. State of Maharashtra AIR 1993 SC 1	Section 167(2) Accused released on default ground cannot be arrested on only count of filing of charge sheet.

193.	Sajid Basir Shaikh V. State of Maharashtra 2005 (3) Mh.L.J. 860	Section 167(2) After charge sheet Right of accused is defeated if he fails to exercise.
194.	Bashir And Others V. State Of Haryana AIR 1978 SC 55	Section 167(2) and 437 Mere filing of charge sheet not sufficient to cancel bail.
195.	B.S. Rawat, Asstt. Collector of Customs V. Mohmed Azan Khan and others 1990 Mh.L.J. 582	Section 167(2) and NDPS Act Limit of 15 days is for police custody and not for other agency custody.
196.	Directorate of Enforcement V. Deepak Mahajan and another AIR 1994 SC 1775	Section 167(2) and S.4(2) Magistrate has jurisdiction to remand in Customs Act case.
197.	Sayed Mohd. Ahmed Kazmi V. State, GNCTD and Ors. AIR 2012 SC 660	Section 167(2) and Unlawful Activities Act Section 43D Magistrate has to grant default bail after the 90 days under Unlawful Activities Act.
198.	Directorate of Enforcement V. Deepak Mahajan and another AIR 1994 SC 1775	Section 167(2) applicable to accused produced by other than police.
199.	Union of India (UOI) V. Thamisharasi and Ors. (1995) 4 SCC 190	Section 167(2) applicable to NDPS Act.
200.	Union of India (UOI) V. Nirala Yadav AIR 2014 SC 3036	Section 167(2) Application filed for default bail cannot be rejected due to filing of charge sheet before decision of bail application.
201.	Anil kumar V. State of Maharashtra 1990 Cri.L.J. 2058	Section 167(2) Bail cancelled by sessions court under section 439(2) in NDPS Case.
202.	Bashir And Others V. State Of Haryana on 3 October, 1977	Section 167(2) Bail cannot be cancelled on mere count of filing charge sheet later on.

203.	Chaganti Satyanarayana and Ors. V. State of Andhra Pradesh AIR 1986 SC 2130	Section 167(2) Date of production before magistrate is starting point.
204.	Directorate of Enforcement V. Deepak Mahajan and another AIR 1994 SC 1775	Section 167(2) Entry in diary in not a sine quo non.
205.	Nijamuddin Mohammad Bashir Khan and Anr. V. State of Maharashtra 2006 Cri.L.J. 4266	Section 167(2) For Section 306 IPC period for filing chargesheet against UTP is 60 days.
206.	State of Uttar Pradesh V. Lakshmi Brahman and Anr. AIR 1983 SC 439	Section 167(2) From charge sheet till committal it is inquiry.
207.	Bhulabai w/o Barkaji Matre V. Shankar Barkaji Matre and others 1999(3) Mh.L.J. 227	Section 167(2) If charge sheet is not filed in time explanation of IO to be called.
208.	Sayed Mohd. Ahmed Kazmi V. State GNCTD and Ors. AIR 2012 SC 660	Section 167(2) in Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967.
209.	Directorate of Enforcement V. Deepak Mahajan and another AIR 1994 SC 1775	Section 167(2) is applicable to accused arrested under FERA Act.
210.	Jeewan Kumar Raut and Anr. V. Central Bureau of Investigation AIR 2009 SC 2763	Section 167(2) is not applicable to offences under TOHO Act as it provides for complaint only.
211.	Satyajit Ballulbhai Desai and Ors. V. State of Gujarat I(2015) CCR 321 (SC)	Section 167(2) Magistrate has to judicially scrutinise circumstances and if satisfied order police custody.
212.	Sayed Mohd. Ahmed Kazmi V. State, GNCTD and Ors. AIR 2012 SC 660	Section 167(2) Magistrate kept application undecided till charge sheet Held accused is entitled for bail.

213.	Hussainara Khaton and Ors. V. Home Secretary, State of Bihar, Patna AIR 1979 SC 1369	Section 167(2) Magistrate shall inform the accused about the right to free legal aid and to provide it.
214.	Aslam Babalal Desai V. State of Maharashtra AIR 1993 SC 1	Section 167(2) Merits not be considered.
215.	Sajid Basir Shaikh V. State of Maharashtra 2005 (3) MhLJ 860	Section 167(2) Not infeasible.
216.	Umashanker And Ors. V. State Of Madhya Pradesh	Section 167(2) Pending bail application allowed.
217.	Nijamuddin Mohammad Bashir Khan and Anr. V. State of Maharashtra 2006 Cri.L.J. 4266	Section 167(2) Period is 60 days for Section 306 IPC.
218.	Shakil Khan Yasin Khan V. The State of Maharashtra MANU-MH-0047-2014	Section 167(2) Period is 60 days for Section 306 IPC.
219.	Rajeev Chaudhary V. State (N.C.T.) of Delhi AIR 2001 SC 2369	Section 167(2) Period is 60 days for Section 386 IPC as punishment does not exceed 10 years.
220.	Bhupinder Singh & Ors V. Jarnail Singh & Anr on 13 July, 2006	Section 167(2) Period is 90 days for Section 304B IPC.
221.	Directorate of Enforcement V. Deepak Mahajan and another AIR 1994 SC 1775	Section 167(2) Remand under FERA Act permissible.
222.	Palanisamy @ Palani V. State rep. by Inspector of Police 2003-1-LW(CrI)239	Section 167(2) Sanction is not part of investigation Magistrate cannot refuse chargesheet.
223.	Suresh Kumar Bhikamchand Jain V. State of Maharashtra and Anr. (2013) 3 SCC 77	Section 167(2) When Charge sheet is filed and Sanction awaited Hence no bail.

224.	Nijamuddin Mohammad Bashir Khan V. State of Maharashtra on 7 July, 2006	Section 167(2)(a)(ii) 60 days for 10 years offence.
225.	Abhinandan Jha and Ors. V. Dinesh Mishra AIR 1968 SC 117	Section 169 and 173 Magistrate cannot direct police to file chargesheet.
226.	Rameshbhai Jagjivan Vora Authorised Signatory of Gaekwad V. State of Gujarat and Ors. 2010 GLH (2) 588	Section 169 application before magistrate is not tenable.
227.	Abhinandan Jha and Ors. V. Dinesh Mishra AIR 1968 SC 117	Section 169 Magistrate cannot direct police to file chargesheet.
228.	Mohd. Rafique Abdul Rahman V. State of Maharashtra 2013 Bom.C.R.(Cri) 251	Section 169 Magistrate does not come in picture under this section.
229.	Maroti V. The State of Maharashtra and Ors. 2015(4) Bom.C.R.(Cri) 504	Section 169 Mere report without final report under Section 173 is not tenable.
230.	Mohd. Rafique V. State of Maharashtra 2013 Bom CR (Cri)251	Section 169 report before Magistratation is not tenable.
231.	Maroti V. The State of Maharashtra Decided on 04.02.2015	Section 169 Report is report of action taken by IO and not final report.
232.	Kedar Narayan Parida & Ors V. State Of Orissa & Anr (2009) 9 SCC 538	Section 169 Report received regarding some accused. Court can direct investigation under Section 156(3).
233.	The State of Bihar V. Chandra Bhushan Singh & Ors. AIR 2001 SC 429	Section 173 and 2(d) A plaint by sub-inspector of RPF is a complaint and not a chargesheet.
234.	State V. Shankar Bhaurao Khirode AIR 1959 Bom 437	Section 173 and Rule 203 of the Bombay Police Manual, Volume III Summaries A B and C explained.

235.	Union Public Service Commission V. S. Papaiah and others AIR 1997 SC 3876	Section 173 Court was not justified in accepting final report without notice to the informant.
236.	Thana Singh V. Central Bureau of Narcotics (2013) 2 SCC 590	Section 173 Electronic charge sheet - SC directed to supply copy of chargesheet in electronic form additionally.
237.	Popular Muthiah V. State represented by Inspector of Police 2006 (2) ACR 2157 (SC)	Section 173 Options available to Magistrate.
238.	Vinay Tyagi V. Irshad Ali (2013) 5 SCC 762	Section 173 Reinvestigation and further investigation is explained.
239.	Abhinandan Jha and Ors. V. Dinesh Mishra AIR 1968 SC 117	Section 173 Report may be one under Section 169 or 170 Magistrate cannot direct to file chargesheet.
240.	Thana Singh V. Central Bureau of Narcotics (2013) 2 SCC 590	Section 173 SC directed to supply copy of chargesheet in electronic form additionally.
241.	Bandi Kotayya V. State (S.H.O. Nandigama) and Ors. AIR 1966 AP 377	Section 173 When cognizance is said to be taken.
242.	Chittaranjan Mirdha V. Dulal Ghosh and Anr. (2009) 6 SCC 661	Section 173(2)(I) Different situations before Magistrate are discussed.
243.	Jakia Nasim Ahesan & Anr. V. State Of Gujarat AIR 2012 SC 243	Section 173(2)(i) Magistrate to issue Notice to the informant if not taking Cognizance.
244.	Rama Chaudhary V. State of Bihar AIR 2009 SC 2308	Section 173(8) (2 Judges Bench held) Magistrates prior permission is not required for further investigation- Reinvestigation is distinct.
245.	Mithabhai Pashabhai Patel and ors. V. State of Gujarat (2009) 6 SCC 332	Section 173(8) Accused directed to appear for interrogation without being arrested.

246.	State through C.B.I. V. Dawood Ibrahim Kaskar and others AIR 1997 SC 2494	Section 173(8) Accused subsequently arrested Magistrate has discretion to try together or separately.
247.	Hemant Dhasmane V. Central Bureau of Investigation and anr. AIR 2001 SC 2721	Section 173(8) can be triggered by Magistrate.
248.	Hasanbhai Valibhai Qureshi V. State of Gujarat and Ors. AIR 2004 SC 2078	Section 173(8) Permits further investigation, and even dehors any direction from the Court as such.
249.	Ram Lal Narang V. State (Delhi Administration) AIR 1979 SC 1791	Section 173(8) Police has power to further investigate but to inform and seek formal permission of Magistrate.
250.	Sri Bhagwan Samardha Sreepada Vallabha Venkata Vishwandadha Maharaj V. State of Andhra Pradesh & Ors AIR 1999 SC 2332	Section 173(8) Police should inform the Magistrate and seek formal permission.
251.	Chandra Babu V. State and Ors. (2015) 8 SCC 774	Section 173(8) Magistrate has jurisdiction to direct further investigation.
252.	Krishna Kumar Variar V. Share Shoppe (2010) 12 SCC 485	Section 177, 178 and 181 Objection of jurisdiction to be raised before summoning Court.
253.	State of Maharashtra V. Anjanabai 1997 Cri.L.J. 2309	Section 177 does not govern Section 223(d) Court can try offences committed in same course of transaction in other jurisdiction.
254.	Y. Abraham Ajith and Ors. V. Inspector of Police, Chennai and Anr. AIR 2004 SC 4286	Section 177 Illtreatment took at husbands place No part of offence at her parents place. Hence complaint returned.
255.	Mahender Goyal V. Messers Kadamba International 2014 Cri.L.J. 1645	Section 177 to 186 Complaint returning procedure laid down by Madras High Court.
256.	Mrs. Minguelin Lobo V. Smt. Archana Sawant MANU-MH-1302-2004	Section 187 If the offence took beyond jurisdiction, the Magistrate should summon accused and then transfer.

257.	Trisuns Chemical Industry V. Rajesh Agarwal and others AIR 1999 SC 3499	Section 187 Power of any Magistrate of the First Class to take cognizance of the offence is not impaired by territorial restrictions.
258.	Musaraf Hossain Khan V. Bhageeratha Engg. Ltd. and Ors. AIR 2006 SC 1288	Section 188 Convenience of the Victim is important.
259.	Ushaben V. Kishorbhai Chunilal Talpada and Ors. 2012 ACR 1859	Section 189A IPC Section 494 cognizable with Section 498A on police report cognizable.
260.	Kishore Kumar Gyanchandani V. G.D. Mehrotra And Anr. AIR 2002 SC 483	Section 190 Acceptance of final report does not debar the Magistrate from taking cognizance on the basis of the materials produced in a complaint proceeding.
261.	Uma Shankar V. State of Bihar and Anr. (2010) 9 SCC 479	Section 190 and 319 Magistrate can take cognizance against the accused named in FIR but omitted in the chargesheet.
262.	SWIL Ltd. V. State of Delhi (2001) 6 SCC 670	Section 190 At the stage of taking cognizance there is no question of Section 319 Messers.
263.	SITA case Bombay (DB) State V. Mainabai AIR 1962 Bom 202	Section 190 Faulty Investiation not to vitiate the trial unless there was prejudice.
264.	Rakesh & anr V. State of Uttar Pradesh 2014 STPL (Web) 524 SC	Section 190 In Sessions cases Magistrate has to see only sufficient ground for proceeding and not required to weigh evidence meticulously SC Nupur Talwar Central Bureau of Investigation.
265.	H.S. Bains V. State (Union Territory of Chandigarh) (1980) 4 SCC 631	Section 190 Magistrate accepted B final report but proceded under Section 200 and 202 and took cognizance.
266.	Vijay Kant Thakur and Anr. V. Stale of Bihar and Anr. 2010 Cri.L.J. 4190	Section 190 Magistrate can differ with PSO on police report and issue process for different sections.

267.	Rajinder Prasad V. Bashir and ors. AIR 2001 SC 3524	Section 190 Magistrate can take cognizance against other accused on subsequent date also.
268.	Chittaranjan Mirdha V. Dulal Ghosh and Anr. (2009) 6 SCC 661	Cr.P.C. S.190 Magistrate can take cognizance against other than charge sheeted.
269.	India Carat Pvt. Ltd V. State Of Karnataka & Anr. on 15 February, 1989	Section 190 Notice to informant is necessary if cognizance is not taken.
270.	Gopal Das Sindhi and Ors. V. The State of Assam and Anr. 1961 Cri.L.J. 39(3JJs)	Section 190 Options to Magistrate explained.
271.	M.C. Mehta V. Union of India (UOI) and Ors. (2007) 1 SCC 110	Section 190 Passing order of Section 156(3) or Search Warrant is not taking Cognizance.
272.	Rajinder Prasad V. Bashir and ors. AIR 2001 SC 3524	Section 190 Trial is not vitiated if the cognizance is valid.
273.	India Carat Pvt. Ltd. V. State of Karnataka & Anr. AIR 1989 SC 885	Section 190(1)(b) Magistrate can proceed against accused not charge sheeted.
274.	India Carat Pvt. Ltd. V. State of Karnataka and Anr. AIR 1989 SC 885	Section 190(1)(b) Magistrate can take cognizance from the material of final report even if police say no offence madeout.
275.	Rattiram and Ors. V. State of M.P. thr. Inspector of Police AIR 2012 SC 1485	Section 190(1)(b) Options to Magistrate He can take cognizance from material of final report even if police say no offence madeout.
276.	Ratiram and others V. State of M.P	Section 193 and SC and ST Act Trial is not vitiated on mere count that Sessions Court directly accepted the chargesheet.
277.	Kishun Singh and Ors. V. State of Bihar (1993) 2 SCC 16	Section 193 Charge-sheet to be returned to police for presenting before JMFC for committal in SC and ST POA Act Referring Officer.

278.	Daulat Ram V. State of Punjab AIR 1962 SC 1206	Section 193 On committal Sessions Court gets jurisdiction to take cognizance against new accused on same material
279.	M. Narayandas V. State Of Karnataka And Ors. 2004 Cri.L.J. 822	Section 195 and IPC Section 182 it is incumbent that a complaint in writing should be made by the public servant concerned for only.
280.	KAMLAPATI TRIVEDI V. STATE OF WEST BENGAL 1979 AIR 777	Section 195 and Section 340 Court can file complaint on the basis of FIR and investigation provided 340 is followed.
281.	Mahesh Chand Sharma V. State of U.P. and Ors. (2009) 15 SCC 519	Section 195 Complaint for Section 500 IPC maintainable though the act falls under Section 211 IPC also.
282.	Syed Muzaffaruddin Khan Mohd. V. Mohd.Abdul Qadir Mohd. Abdul	Section 195 No bar to complaint of false mutation entry outside court.
283.	M.L. Sethi V. R.P. Kapur and Anr. AIR 1967 SC 528	Section 195 Not a bar to order of Section 156(3) as the bar comes after investigation Then Court can file complaint.
284.	State of Punjab V. Brij Lal Palta AIR 1969 SC 355	Section 195 Registrar Co-op. societies is not a Court.
285.	Nandkishor Laxminarayan Mundhada And Ors 2008 Cri.L.J. 990	Section 195 There can be no objection to the continuance of proceedings relating to offences for other than those covered by Sections 182, 211 and 193 IPC.
286.	Iqbal Singh Marwah and Anr. V. Meenakshi Marwah and Anr. AIR 2005 SC 2119	Section 195 Will forged prior to production before court. No bar.
287.	Abdul Rehman and Ors. V. K.M. Anees-ul-Haq 2012 Cri.L.J. 1060	Section 195(1) Bars unless the complaint is by the Court.
288.	Kamlapati Trivedi V. State of West Bengal AIR 1979 SC 777	Section 195(1)(b) attracted for Section 211 IPC.

289.	Chartered Accountants of India V. Vimal Kumar Surana and Anr. (2011) 1 SCC (Cri) 442	Section 195(1)(b) Complaint by Court required for Section 211 offence on False police Report.
290.	M.S. Sheriff V. The State of Madras and Ors. AIR 1954 SC 397	Section 195(1)(b)(ii) and 4 Case on police report is tenable by excluding the offences which can be taken cognizance on complaint.
291.	Durgacharan Naik and Ors. V. State of Orissa AIR 1966 SC 1775	Section 195(3) Criminal proceedings should be given precedence and the civil proceedings should be stayed.
292.	General Officer Commanding V. CBI and Anr. AIR 2012 SC 1890	Section 197 (Overruled) For want of sanction accused was acquitted instead of discharge.
293.	State of Madhya Pradesh V. Sheetla Sahai and Ors. (2009) 8 SCC 617	Section 197 and P.C. Act Section 19 Sanction is required for taking cognizance and not for taking charge sheet.
294.	Ram Kumar V. State of Haryana AIR 1987 SC 735	Section 197 Criminal Breach of trust is not part of duty.
295.	State of U.P. V. Paras Nath Singh 2009 Cri.L.J. 3069	Section 197 For want of sanction accused was acquitted instead of discharge.
296.	Suresh Kumar Bhikamchand Jain V. Pandey Ajay Bhushan and Ors. AIR 1998 SC 1524	Section 197 Necessit of sanction can be considered after evidence when it cannot be decided without evidence.
297.	Mohd. Hadi Raja V. State of Bihar and Anr. AIR 1998 SC 1945	Section 197 not applicable to public sector undertaking employee.
298.	Parkash Singh Badal and Anr. V. State of Punjab and Ors (2007) 1 SCC 1	Section 197 Power under Section 156(3) is discretionary.
299.	Rizwan Ahmed Javed Shaikh & Ors V. Jammal Patel and Ors. AIR 2001 SC 2198	Section 197 Real test is if the complained acts were not done should it amount to dereliction of duty then sanction is necessary.

300.	Suresh Kumar Bhikamchand Jain V. Pandey Ajay Bhushan and Ors. AIR 1998 SC 1524	Section 197 Whether the accused was discharging public servant's duty or not can be considered during the progress of the case.
301.	Ashwin Nanubhai Vyas V. State of Maharashtra & Anr. AIR 1967 SC 983	Section 198 and Section 495 of IPC complainant died mother continued complaint.
302.	Ushaben V. Kishorbhai Chunilal Talpada & Ors. 2012 ACR 1859	Section 199 Where police took no action inspite of information remedy lies in filing complaint.
303.	Divine Retreat Centre V. State of Kerala & Ors. AIR 2008 SC 1614	Section 200 in N.I. Act cases Affidavits are allowed in lieu of verification.
304.	Rajesh Bhalchandra Chalke V. State of Maharashtra and Emco Dynatorq Pvt. Ltd. 2011 (1) Mh.L.J. 244	Section 200 Second complaint on same facts when tenable remanded to High Court.
305.	Devendra Kishanlal Dagalia V. Dwarkesh Diamonds Pvt. Ltd. & Ors. AIR 2014 SC 655	Section 202 Amended Examining witnesses is a compliance of postponement.
306.	Vijay Dhanuka Etc. V. Najima Mamtaj Etc. 2014 Cri.L.J. 2295	Section 202 In session triable offences it is not mandatory but advisable to examine all witnesses.
307.	Shivjee Singh V. Nagendra Tiwary and Ors. AIR 2010 SC 2261	Section 202 Inquiry mandatory when accused is from far away place.
308.	Magistrate and Ors. AIR1998SC128	Section 202 Once complaint was quashed on the ground of similar complaint being pending further complaint is not tenable.
309.	Rajeev Sawhney V. State Bank of Mauritius Ltd. & Ors. 2011(6) Mh.L.J. 401	Section 202 Shall does not mean mandatory Not necessary to examine all witnesses in inquiry.
310.	Shivjee Singh V. Nagendra Tiwary and Ors. AIR2010SC2261	Section 203 Magistrate has no jurisdiction to recall the process.

311.	Adalat Prasad V. Rooplal Jindal and Ors. (2004) 7 SCC 338	Section 203 Sessions Trial case dismissed by Magistrate an error within jurisdiction.
312.	Kewal Krishan Lachman Das V. Suraj Bhan and Anr. AIR 1980 SC 1780	Section 204 (Check this ratio) On receiving police report process need not be issued.
313.	Nilesh Daulatrao Lakhani V. State of Maharashtra 2014 (4) Bom CR (Cri) 757	Section 204 Adalat Prasad case applicable to Summons and Warrant cases.
314.	Subramaniam Sethuraman V. State of Maharashtra and Anr. (2004) 13 SCC 324	Section 204 Challenge to jurisdiction shall be made by application before trial court.
315.	Krishna Kumar Variar V. Share Shoppe 2010 Cri.L.J. 3848	Section 204 Check this ratio On receiving police report process need not be issued.
316.	Nilesh Daulatrao Lakhani V. State of Maharashtra 2014 (4) Bom CR (Cri)757	Section 204 Court can insist for process fee in non cognizable offences.
317.	Bhushan Kumar and Anr. V. State (NCT of Delhi) and Anr. AIR 2012 SC 1747	Section 204 order is not interlocutory Magistrate cannot review.
318.	Bhushan Kumar and Anr. V. State (NCT of Delhi) and Anr. AIR 2012 SC 1747	Section 204 Summons is a process issued by court calling to appear; Taking cognizance means becoming aware of and to take notice of judicially.
319.	Raj Kishore Prasad V. State of Bihar and another AIR 1996 SC 1931	Section 209 After committal it cannot be said that the Magistrate has jurisdiction over the case.
320.	Bhushan Kumar and Anr. V. State (NCT of Delhi) and Anr. (2012) 5 SCC 422	Section 209 Committal under the new Code is not an enquiry strictly speaking.
321.	Chhotan Sao and Anr. V. State of Bihar AIR 2014 SC 907	Section 209 Magistrate has a duty to secure the Vicera Report etc before the committal.

322.	Raj Kishore Prasad V. State of Bihar and another AIR 1996 SC 1931	Section 209 Magistrate has no power to summon a new accused at the stage of committal.
323.	State of Uttar Pradesh V. Lakshmi Brahman and Anr. AIR 1983 SC 439	Section 209 Supplying copies under Section 207 is judicial function and without its compliance there can be no committal.
324.	Chhotan Sao and anr V. State of Bihar AIR 2014 SC 907	Section 209 Without obtaining the forensic report committal by Magistrate is mechanical and without applying mind.
325.	Pal @ Palla V. State of Uttar Pradesh (2010) 10 SCC 123	Section 210 Clubbing of police case and complaint case is not permissible when the accused or the offences are not same.
326.	State V. Ram Kanwar 1984 (1) Crimes 1040	Section 212(2) is an enabling provision.
327.	Ranchhodlal V. State Of Madhya Pradesh AIR 1965 SC 1248	Section 212, 219 and 220 are enabling provisions for joinder of trials.
328.	Ranchhodlal V. State Of Madhya Pradesh 1965 AIR 1248	Section 218 and 219 Charge IPC Section 409 Consecutive sentence in separate trials upheld.
329.	Manoharlal Lohe V. State of Madhya Pradesh 1981 Cri.L.J. 1563	Section 218 and S.409 IPC Accused never objected joint trial and hence consenting party and hence conviction upheld.
330.	Birichh Bhuian and Ors. V. State of Bihar AIR 1963 SC 1120	Section 218 Difference between irregularity and illegality in joinder of Charges.
331.	Ranchhodlal V. State Of Madhya Pradesh 1965 AIR 1248	Section 219 Charge IPC Section 409 Consecutive sentence in separate trials upheld.
332.	Aklak Ahmed Fakruddin Patel V. State of Maharashtra 2011 Cri.L.J. 126	Section 220 Clubbing of police case for Section 498A and 306 and complaint case for Section 302 and 304B against same accused has been upheld.

333.	Manivannan And S. Krishnamoorthy V. P.R. Adhikesavan MANU-TN-0178-2008	Section 220 Complainant filed separate cases of Section 420 IPC and Section 138 NI Act Held separate trials were not improper.
334.	Narinderjit Singh Sahni and anr. V. Union of India and ors AIR 2001 SC 3810	Section 220 Each depositors case is individual offence.
335.	Nova Vision Electronics Pvt. Ltd. & Anr. V. State and Anr. 2011 Cri.L.J. 868	Section 220 For separate cheque separate trial has been justified.
336.	Praveen V. State Of Maharashtra 2001 Cri.L.J. 3417	Section 220 Same transaction Kidnapping from Nagpur Rape in Jabalpur Either Court can try.
337.	K. Prema S. Rao V. Yadla Srinivasa Rao AIR 2003 SC 11	Section 221 Convicted for Section 306 along with Section 498A though charged with Section 304B and 498A.
338.	Samadhan Baburao Khakare and Ors. V. The State of Maharashtra and Ors. 1995(2) Mh.L.J. 464	Section 222(2) Major and the minor offences must be cognate offences having main ingredients in common.
339.	Lalu Prasad @ Lalu Prasad Yadav V. State through C.B.I AIR 2003 SC 3838	Section 223 On the application of accused the Magistrate may amalgamate cases. He can read one case evidence in the other.
340.	Banti @ Guddu V. State of Madhya Pradesh AIR 2004 SC 261	Section 226 and 231 APP can choose and pick his witnesses.
341.	(Satish Mehra (1996) 9 SCC 766 Overruled) in State Of Orissa V. Debendra Nath Padhi A.I.R. 2005 SCC 369	Section 226 Anticipatory bail in UP upheld by SC.
342.	Dinesh Tiwari V. State of Uttar Pradesh On 07.07.2014 MANU-SC-0587- 2014	Section 227 and 239 Material produced by accused not to be considered.
343.	V. C. Shukla V. State Through C.B.I AIR 1980 SC AIR	Section 227 Documents produced by accused cannot be considered at the time of Charge.

344.	Niranjan Singh Karan Singh V. Jitendra Bhimraj Bijje AIR 1990 SC 1962	Section 227 Framing Charge is Interlocutory order.
345.	Smt. Snehalata Mondal V. State of West Bengal (2008) 1 CALLT 297 (HC)	Section 227 Though Trial cannot consider documents of accused High Court can consider under Section 482.
346.	State of Bombay V. Mohamadh Khan AIR 1960 Bom 150	Section 229 Subsequent plea of guilty accepted.
347.	Rohtash Kumar V. State of Haryana (2013) 14 SCC 434	Section 231 Additional witness for prosecution can be allowed.
348.	Ram Deo Chauhan V. State of Assam (2001) 5 SCC 714	Section 231 and Evidence Act Section 114 Prosecution is not bound to examine all listed witnesses.
349.	Narpal Singh & Others V. State of Haryana AIR 1977 SC 1066	Section 235(2) Accused upon conviction can be sent to jail until hearing on sentence.
350.	Modilal Kaluram Kachhara And Etc. V. State Of Maharashtra 1988 Cri.L.J.	Section 235(2) To hear on sentence de novo trial not necessary.
351.	Kanti Bhadra Shah and Anr. V. The State of West Bengal AIR 2000 SC 522	Section 239 Magistrate need not write order for framing charge but has to write order for discharge.
352.	M. Joy Varghese V. The State ANU-TN- 0365-2011	Section 239 Under Section 482 no bar to the High Court to consider the documents produced by accused.
353.	Sunil Mehta and Anr. V. State of Gujarat and Anr. 2013 (2) Bom CR (Cri) 335	Section 244 Statements of Section 202 are not EBC.
354.	Cricket Association of Bengal & ors V. State of West Bengal and ors. AIR 1971 SC 1971	Section 245(2) Complaint can be dismissed before charge.

355.	Luis De Piedade Lobo V. Mahadev Vishwanath Parulekar 1984 Cri.L.J. 513	Section 245(2) Opportunity to adduce EBC should be given to the Complaint.
356.	Gurmukh Singh and Ors. V. The State of Punjab (1972) 4 SCC 805	Section 248(2) Conviction not bad for failure to adopt procedure applicable to complaint-warrant case.
357.	Sagunabai Lahanu Shende V. Patru Goma Lengure and others 1979 Mh.L.J. 18	Section 249 cannot be invoked after charge.
358.	Narayandas Narayandas Gulabchand Agrawal V. Rakesh Kumar Nem Kumar Porwal 1996 (2) Mh.L.J. 463	Section 249 Magistrate is not empowered to restore a complaint.
359.	IND Synergy Ltd. V. Goyal MG Gases Pvt. Ltd. III (2014) BC 433 (Del)	Section 251 Adalat Prasad case would not come in way for objection to jurisdiction.
360.	Jhantu Das V. State of Tripura (2007) 2 GLR 443	Section 251 If the admitted facts do not amount to offence accused can not be convicted.
361.	Girraj Prasad Meena V. State of Rajasthan and Ors 2013 (12) SCALE 275	Section 252 Plead guilty for lessor offences set aside as informant had no opportunity to apply for adding charges or accused.
362.	Shri Sandeep Indravadan Sagar V. State of Maharashtra and others on 10.01.2013	Section 252 Rubber stamp used for recording plea of accused Court upheld the order.
363.	State of Maharashtra V. Maruti Dadu Kamble 1988 Mh.L.J. 49	Section 255 Magistrate should issue summons on request of the prosecution, but can refuse to adjourn if no efforts taken to serve the summons.
364.	Jethalal Girdharlal V. State of Gujarat (1984) 2 GLR 964	Section 255(2) and Prohibition Act Section 66(1)(b) Hearing on sentence gives accused to show special reason for less than minimum punishment.

365.	Jethalal Girdharlal V. State of Gujarat MANU-GJ-0206-1984	Section 255(2) and Section 66(1)(b) Magistrat has to hear the accused on sentence.
366.	Narayandas Gulabchand Agrawal 1996-2- Mh.L.J. 463	Section 256 and 249 Bombay says Magistrate has no jurisdiction to restore a dismissed complaint.
367.	Om Gayatri and company V. State of Maharashtra 2006 Cr.L.J. 601	Section 256 No revision lies against order under section.
368.	Associated Cement Co. Ltd V. Keshvanand AIR 1998 SC 596	Section 256 Court should not insist for presence of particular person should not dismiss if evidence already recorded.
369.	Harishchandra @ Sunil Rajara Rasker V. Kantilal Virchand Vora & another 1998 Cri.L.J. 3754	Section 256 Magistrate cannot restore complaint.
370.	Madankumar Dharamchand Jain and Anr. V. State of Maharashtra and Anr. 1983(1) Bom CR 416	Section 256 Magistrate has no power to recall the dismissal order.
371.	Maj. Genl. A.S. Gauraya and Anr. V. S.N. Thakur and Anr. AIR 1986 SC 1440	Section 256 Magistrate not empowered to restore dismissed complaint.
372.	S. Rama Krishna V. S. Rami Reddy AIR 2008 SC 2066	Section 256(1) Magistrate has to dismiss complaint unless decided to adjourn for some cause.
373.	State of Maharashtra V. Maruti Dadu Kamble 1988 Mh.L.J. 49	Section 258 After summons only Magistrate can close case.
374.	Pramatha Nath Mukherjee V. The State of West Bengal AIR 1960 SC 810	Section 259 After discharging from warrant case trying summons case under chapter 20 is valid.
375.	Zafar and others V. State of U.P. 1968 AWR (H.C.) 38281	Section 263 and 264 of old Cr.P.C Notes of evidence when need not be retained.

376.	Guerrero Lugo Elvia Grissel V. The State of Maharashtra 2012 Cri.L.J. 1136	Section 265A Notification of the excluded Acts.
377.	State V. K.N.Nehru on 3 November, 2011	Section 265E Court has no discretion to award sentence other than one- fourth of the punishment.
378.	Ramesh Kumar Singh V. State Of Bihar And Ors. on 17 December, 1986	Section 267 Formal arrest of the accused in Jail.
379.	State of Maharashtra V. Yadav Natthuji Kohachade 2000 Cri.L.J. 959	Section 267 Non production of prisoners.
380.	State of Maharashtra and P.C. Singh V. Dr. Praful B. Desai and Anr. AIR 2003 SC 2053	Section 267 Procedure of Production Warrant.
381.	The State of Maharashtra V. Bhaurao Doma Udan and Others 1996 (1) Mh. L.J. 214	Section 273 Evidence on commission through VC allowed in Criminal cases.
382.	Mir Mohd. Omar and Ors. V. State of West Bengal AIR 1989 SC 1785	Section 278 Not reding over deposition but making available for his reading was sufficient.
383.	The State Of Maharashtra V. Manik Mohan Gaikwad on 26 November, 2008	Section 279 Evidence's language unknown to accused, but known to advocates.
384.	Rajesh Kumar and Anr. V. State Govt. of NCT of Delhi (2008) 4 SCC 493	Section 291A Test Identification Parade and purpose No provision in Cr.P.C. which obliges investigation agency to hold identification parade.
385.	Kodadi Srinivasa Lingam and Ors. V. State of A.P. 2001 Cri.L.J. 602 A.P	Section 293(1) Not obligatory that the expert on the scientific issue of the chemical examination of substance, should be made to depose in proceedings before Court.
386.	Guwahati Sub-Divisional Market Committee V. Suresh Sikaria 2013 (4) GLT 486	Section 294 Admitted documents can be read in evidence.

387.	Himachal Pradesh Administration V. Om Prakash AIR 1972 SC 975	Section 294 application by accused shall be considered only statement of Section 313.
388.	State of Punjab V. Naib Din AIR 2001 SC 3955	Section 294 Proof without examining the expert.
389.	Constitution Bench Dharam Pal and Ors. V. State of Haryana and Anr. MANU-SC-0720-2013	Section 296 What is formal evidence which can be taken on affidavit is explained.
390.	Jayendra Vishnu Thakur V. State of Maharashtra and Anr. (2009) 7 SCC 104	Section 299 and 193 After committal Sessions Judge has jurisdiction to summon accused named in column no.2.
391.	Jayendra Vishnu Thakur V. State of Maharashtra and Anr. (2009) 7 SCC 104	Section 299 is applicable when the accused intentionally makes inaccessible and not merely when it is shown that it is not possible to trace him.
392.	Nirmal Singh V. State of Haryana AIR 2000 SC 1416	Section 299 On surrender of accused attachment to be vacated.
393.	Smt. Urmila Sahu V. State of Orissa 1998 Cri.L.J. 1372	Section 299 second part is exception to Section 33 of Evidence Act.
394.	Central Bureau of Investigation V. Abu Salem Ansari and Anr. (2011) 4 SCC 426	Section 299 Unless common evidence is recorded the evidence against the tried accused cannot be read against absconding accused.
395.	Monica Bedi V. State of A.P. (2011) 1 SCC 284	Section 299(1) will be applicable if any of its conditions are satisfied.
396.	Thomas Dana V. The State of Punjab AIR 1959 SC 375	Section 300 Double jeopardy To operate as a bar the second prosecution and the consequential punishment thereunder, must be for 'the same offence.
397.	Sangeetaben Mahendrabhai Patel V. State of Gujarat and Anr. AIR 2012 SC 2844	Section 300 Double Jeopardy's 3 requisites.

398.	State of Karnataka through CBI V. C. Nagarajaswamy AIR 2005 SC4308	Section 300 No Double Jeopardy in Dishonor of Cheque case even if there was a case under Section 420 IPC.
399.	Mohammed Ajmal Mohammad Amir Kasab V. State of Maharashtra AIR 2012 SC 3565	Section 301 Trial on Sunday without legal aid was setaside.
400.	Sitaram Sao V. State of Jharkhand AIR 2008 SC 391	Section 302 Free legal aid should be provided from the stage of remand.
401.	Narayan Chetanram Chaudhary and Anr. V. State of Maharashtra AIR 2000 SC 3352	Section 306 Pardon is not right Applicable without committal 307 applicable after committal.
402.	Santosh Kumar Satishbhusan Bariyar V. State of Maharashtra (2009) 6 SCC 498	Section 306(1) Pardon is not right Applicable without committal 307 applicable after committal.
403.	State of Himachal Pradesh V. Surinder Mohan And Others AIR 2000 SC 1862	Section 306(1) Pardon Procedure.
404.	A. Deivendran V. State of T.N. AIR 1998 SC 2821	Section 306(4) Accused has no right of cross examination of the approver.
405.	Asokan L.S. V. State of Kerala 2005 Cri.L.J. 3848	Section 306(4)(a) Examination of approver is mandatory if pardon tendered before committal but not mandatory if tendered by sessions court after committal.
406.	The State of Maharashtra V. Shanti Prasad Jain 1978 Mh.L.J. 227	Section 306(4)(a) Statement of approver is not admissible under Section 33 Evidence Act.
407.	Narayan Chetanram Chaudhary & Anr. V. State of Maharashtra AIR 2000 SC 3352	Section 306(5) CJM and ACJM and CMM and ACMM have equal jurisdiction.

408.	Mrinal Das and Ors. V. The State of Tripura AIR 2011 SC 3753	Section 307 After committal the approver need not be examined twice.
409.	Narayan Chetanram Chaudhary and Anr. V. State of Maharashtra AIR 2000 SC 3352	Section 307 is applicable after committal.
410.	Jasbir Singh V. Vipin Kumar Jaggi and Ors. AIR 2001 SC 2734	Section 307 is invocable at post-commitment while Section 306 is invocable at precommitment state.
411.	P. Ramachandra Rao V. State of Karnataka AIR 2002 SC 1856	Section 307 pardon is by Court NDPS Act Section 64 is by executive Later overrides.
412.	Thana Singh V. Central Bureau of Narcotics 2013 Cri.L.J. 1262 circulated in Pune	Section 309 Common Cause and Rajdeo Sharma Cases are overruled.
413.	Vinod Kumar V. State of Punjab dd in 2012	Section 309 Criminal Trials Directions for day to day trials.
414.	Abdul Rehman Antulay etc. etc. V. R.S. Nayak and another etc. AIR 1992 SC 1701	Section 309 Directions given not to grant adjournments casually.
415.	N.G. Dastanevs.Shrikant V. S. Shivde and Anr. AIR 2001 SC 2028	Section 309 It is neither permissible nor possible nor desirable to lay down an outer limit of time.
416.	Bipin Shantilal Panchal V. State of Gujarat and Anr. AIR 2001 SC 1158	Section 309 Magistrate new spared from adverse remarks for allowing Advocates misconduct in seeking adjournment.
417.	Ram Deo Chauhan @ Raj Nath V. State of Assam AIR 2001 SC 2231	Section 309 Neither permissible nor possible nor desirable to lay down an outer limit of time.
418.	Hussainara Khatoon and Ors. V. Home Secretary, State of Bihar, Patna AIR 1979 SC 1360	Section 309 On conviction accused to be taken into custody pending punishment.

419.	P. Ramachandra Rao V. State of Karnataka AIR 2002 SC 1856	Section 309 Speedy trial is of the essence of criminal justice.
420.	Mohd. Khalid V. State of West Bengal (2002) 7 SCC 334	Section 309 Time cannot be fixed by Supreme Court for conclusion of trials.
421.	State of U.P. V. Shambhu Nath Singh & Ors. AIR 2001 SC 1403	Section 309 Unnecessary adjournments give a scope for a grievance that accused persons get a time to get over the witnesses.
422.	Sasi Thomas V. State and Ors. (2006) 12 SCC 421	Section 309 When witnesses are present and accused causes adjournment Court can remand accused or direct payment of expenses present.
423.	Nageshwar Shri Krishna Ghobe V. State of Maharashtra AIR 1973 SC 165	Section 311 Just decision does not necessarily mean a decision in favour of defence.
424.	Fatehsinh Mohansinh Chauhan V. Union Territory of Dadra and Nagar Haveli 2003 Bom CR (Cri) 1103	Section 311 Parties cannot control the Court's discretion to have any additional evidence.
425.	Rajendra Prasad V. The Narcotic Cell AIR 1999 SC 2292	Section 311 Recall of witness allowed.
426.	Iddar and Ors. V. Aabida and Anr. AIR 2007 SC 3029	Section 311 The power of the Court was plenary to summon or even recall any witness at any stage of the case.
427.	Laxman alias Laxmayya V. The State of Maharashtra 2012 Cri.L.J. 2826	Section 311 Witness recalled to depose as they turned hostile previously due to threats by the accused.
428.	Dr. Sunil Clifford Daniel V. State of Punjab 2012 Cri.L.J. 4657	Section 313 Accused be informed that he can decline to give answers and his inculpatory statements may be taken into consideration.
429.	Basavaraj R. Patil and Others V. State of Karnataka and Others AIR 2000 SC 3214	Section 313 and PC Act Failure of accused to offer appropriate explanation or giving false answer may be counted as providing a missing link.

430.	State of Maharashtra V. Maruti Dadu Kamble 1988 Mh.L.J. 49	Section 313 Counsel cannot be examined.
431.	Re Kannammal @ Maunammal 92 Ind. Cas. 695	Section 313(1)(b) Accused should be Warned.
432.	Basavaraj R. Patil and Others V. State of Karnataka and Others AIR 2000 SC 3214 (3JJs)	Section 313(1)(b) Advocate cannot be examined but questionire for accused can be given.
433.	Satyavir Singh Rathi V. State thr. C.B.I. AIR 2011 SC 1748	Section 313(1)(b) Statement is not Evidence.
434.	Messers Bhaskar Industries Ltd. V. Messers Bhiwani Denim and Apparels Ltd. AIR 2001 SC 3625	Section 317 Personal exemption when can be granted.
435.	Hardeep Singh etc. V. State of Punjab and Ors. etc. 2014 (1) SCALE 241	Section 319 A person discharged can be arraigned again as accused after an inquiry as contemplated by Section 300(5) and 398.
436.	Bholu Ram V. State of Punjab and Anr. 2008 Cri.L.J. 4576 SC	Section 319 Accused can apply to Magistrate.
437.	Rakesh and Anr. V. State of Haryana AIR 2001 SC 2521	Section 319 Accused named in FIR but excluded police can be summoned even without cross exam of the witness.
438.	Dr. S.S. Khanna V. Chief Secretary, Patna and Anr. AIR 1983 SC 595	Section 319 Magistrate can proceed against an accused whom the Magistrate refused to Summon.
439.	Uma Shankar V. State of Bihar and Anr. (2010) 9 SCC 479	Section 319 Magistrate can take cognizance against the accused named in FIR but omitted in the charge sheet.
440.	Kishori Singh and Ors. V. State of Bihar and Anr. AIR 2000 SC 3725	Section 319 Magistrate cannot issue process to FIR named but chargesheet unnamed accused at committal stage.
441.	Rajendra Singh V. State of U.P. and Anr. AIR 2007 SC 2786	Section 319 Purpose of this power is Explained.

442.	FB Abasaheb Yadav Honmane V. The State of Maharashtra 2008 2 Mh.L.J. 856	Section 320 At any stage permissible.
443.	Rajesh Rajesh Kannan V. A.K. Murthy and Ors. 2009-2-UC 879	Section 320 Non-compoundable case unfit for mediation & conciliation.
444.	Hirabhai Jhaverbhai V. State of Gujarat and Ors. AIR 2010 SC 2321	Section 320 Offence of S.324 IPC prior to amendment is compoundable.
445.	Rameshchandra J. Thakkar V. Assandas Parmanand Jhaveri, State of Maharashtra AIR1973SC84	Section 320 Partly compounding is not permissible.
446.	Rajinder Singh V. State (Delhi Administration) AIR 1980 SC 1200	Section 320 Partly compounding was maintained without discussion on validity.
447.	Gian Singh V. State of Punjab and Anr. (2010) 15 SCC 118	Section 320 Referring to Larger Bench as Section 420 IPC is compoundable and Section 120B is non compoundable.
448.	Abasaheb Yadav Honmane V. The State of Maharashtra 2008 2 Mh.L.J. 856	Section 320 Under Section 482 non-compoundable offence's FIR can be quashed.
449.	Sheonandan Paswan V. State of Bihar and Ors. AIR 1987 SC 877	Section 321 Grounds for seeking Courts consent for withdrawal.
450.	Sudhir and ors. etc. V. State of M.P. etc. AIR 2001 SC 826	Section 323 Sessions Judge has power to try any offence Cross cases should be tried by him.
451.	Khoda Bux Mal V. Ohadali Mal AIR 1949 Cal 308	Section 325 Magistrate has to write an order but not judgment.
452.	Addl. Judicial First Class Magistrate V. State of A.P. 2005 Cri.L.J. 1168 DB	Section 325 When Magistrate cannot exceed the limit of Section 29 for want of special provision he has to resort to Section 325 and not 323.

453.	Rajagopal V. Forest Range Officer 2012 (1) CTC 639	Section 325(1) Magistrate has to record finding of guilty and CJM cannot send back case.
454.	Nagesh V. State of Karnataka 1990 Cri.L.J. 2234	Section 325(1) Magistrate to record finding and then refer to CJM.
455.	Jaikishan Kanjiwani V. Kumar Matching Centre 2011 Cri.L.J. 134	Section 326 and Section 138 N.I. Act Evidence and not substance of evidence is recorded.
456.	Ramilaben Trikamlal Shah Tube and Allied Products and others	Section 326 and N.I. Act Section 138 Evidence on affidavit followed by cross. De novo not required.
457.	Mohd. Hussain @ Julfikar Ali 2012 Cri.L.J. 4537	Section 326 Denovo Trial In an extremely serious case of exceptional nature it would occasion in failure of justice if Prosecution is not taken to logical conclusion.
458.	Ranbir Yadav V. State of Bihar AIR 1995 SC 1219	Section 326 Discretion given to court to read previous evidence.
459.	Pratibha Pandurang Salvi V. State of Maharashtra 2010 Cri.L.J. 730	Section 326 Once the Magistrate used the discretion to try summarily, on his transfer it should be de novo.
460.	J.V. Baharuni V. State of Gujarat (2014) 10 SCC 494	Section 326(3) and NI Act Section 138 and 142. If the evidence was not recorded summarily but fully then no need of de novo.
461.	Nitinbhai Saevatilal Shah and Anr. V. Manubhai Manjibhai Panchal & Anr. AIR 2011 SC 3076	Section 326(3) and Section 138 NI Act Pursis of accused would not make legal to read evidence recorded by previous Magistrate.
462.	Shyambahadur Purshottam Sharma V. Shri. Sudhakar Narshu Poojary MANU-MH-1393-2013	Section 326(3) De novo Trial not necessary.
463.	K. Jayachandran V. O. Nargeese and Anr. 1987 Cri.L.J. 1997	Section 326(3) No need of denovo trial.

464.	Abdul Sukkur Barbhuiya V. The State of Assam and others, Gauhati HC Dated 24.01.2012	Section 326(3) Sessions Court to record evidence de novo.
465.	State of Punjab V. Gurmit Singh and Others AIR 1996 SC 1393	Section 327 In camera proceeding Directions.
466.	Sakshi V. Union of India and Ors. AIR 2004 SC 3566	Section 327 In camera trial and not to disclose the name of the victim.
467.	The State of Maharashtra V. Subhashsing Shalikramsingh Raghuwanshi 1995 (1) Mh.L.J. 358	Section 334 Acquittal case Course to be adopted while acquitting on insanity ground.
468.	Ms. Leena Balkrishna Nair V. The State of Maharashtra 2010 Cri.L.J. 3392	Section 338 and IPC Section 84 Accused was acquitted and released under section 338 of Cr.P.C.
469.	State of Maharashtra V. Sukhdeo Singh and another AIR 1992 SC 2100	Section 342 (3) Answers given by accused may be taken into consideration at enquiry or Trial.
470.	D.K. Basu V. State of West Bengal AIR 1997 SC 610	Section 342 Compensation to the victim.
471.	Arun Paswan, S.I. V. State of Bihar and Ors. JT 2003 (10) SC 459	Section 345 Contempt of Court by police officer.
472.	The Superintendent of Police V. The Judicial Magistrate Court, Cheyyar IV (2015) CCR 502 (Mad.)	Section 349 and 91 Notice should be issued before taking action.
473.	Dayal Singh and Ors. V. State of Uttaranchal AIR 2012 SC 3046	Section 353 Court is competent to direct departmental action against erring officers.
474.	Satya Narain V. State of Rajasthan 1987 WLN (UC) Raj 458	Section 353 Judgment pronounced in absence of accused was upheld as he was present during the trial.

475.	A.T. Prakashan V. The Excise Inspector and Anr. 2014 ALL.M.R. (Cri) 1945	Section 353 Misquoting of the Section or misapplying the provisions has caused no prejudice Hence conviction maintained.
476.	State of Gujarat V. Kishanbhai Supreme (2014) 5 SCC 108	Section 354 Acquittal case A finding needs to be recorded in each acquittal case whether the lapse was innocent or blameworthy.
477.	Complainant Ganesha V. Sharanappa and anr. AIR 2014 SC 1198	Section 354 and 154 The person who lodges the FIR be called the Informant.
478.	Anil @ Anthony Arikswamy Joseph V. State of Maharashtra (2014) 4 SCC 69	Section 354 (3) Court has to discharge its constitutional obligations and honour legislative policy by awarding appropriate sentence, that is will of people.
479.	R. Vijayan V. Baby and Anr. AIR 2012 SC 528	Section 357 Compensation in Section 138 N.I. Act cases should include costs and loss.
480.	Ankush Shivaji Gaikwad V. State of Maharashtra AIR 2013 SC 2454	Section 357 Every Courts Mandatory duty to consider compensation.
481.	Ram Pal V. T.S. Thakur and Adarsh Kumar Goes JT 2015 (2) SC 496	Section 357 State to compensation in Section 304A IPC where accused is unable to pay.
482.	R. Mohan V. A.K. Vijaya Kumar 2012 CriLJ3953	Cr.P.C. S.357(3) (Simple) Imprisonment in default of compensation was justified
483.	Dilip S. Dhanukar V. Kotak Mahindra Co. Ltd. and Anr. MANU-SC-8289-2007	Section 357(3) Compensation to be less than recoverable in civil court.
484.	K.A. Abbas H.S.A. V. Sabu Joseph and Anr. (2010) 6 SCC 230	Section 357(3) Default sentence of compensation is legal.
485.	Sunil alias Pona Tolaram Pore (Varma) V. State of Maharashtra	Section 360 not applicable to Maharashtra Probation not available for Section 326 IPC.

486.	Chandreshwar Sharma V. State of Bihar (2000) 9 SCC 245	Section 361 Court shall give reasons for denial of benefit of probation.
487.	Eliamma and Anr. V. State of Karnataka (2009) 11 SCC 42	Section 361 Mandatory to give reasons.
488.	State of Punjab V. Prem Sagar and Ors. 2008 Cri.L.J. 3533	Section 361 Sentence would depend on many factors.
489.	Rupam Pralhad Bhartiya V. State of Maharashtra and Anr. MANU-MH-1005-2011	Section 361 Special Reasons to be given for not granting probation HC increased fine to one lakh.
490.	State of Punjab V. Davinder Pal Singh Bhullar and Ors	Section 362 High Court has no power under Section 482 to review.
491.	Minu Kumari and Anr. V. The State of Bihar and Ors. AIR 2006 SC 1937	Section 362 Magistrate can drop proceeding against against whom process was issued by mistake.
492.	Mohd. Chaman V. State (N.C.T. of Delhi) 2001 Cri.L.J. 725	Section 366 propositions to be kept in mind for determination of question of death sentence.
493.	Re The Additional District Judge-cum- Chief Judicial Magistrate, Nagapattinam 2003-1-LW (Crl) 77	Section 374 and 9 Additional Sessions Judge can hear an appeal from Assistant Sessions Judge if punishment was less than 7 Years.
494.	State of MP V. Bacchudas alias Balram and Ors AIR 2007 SC 1236	Section 374 Appellate Court duties.
495.	Dilip S. Dhanukar V. Kotak Mahindra Co. Ltd. and Anr. MANU-SC-8289-2007	Section 374 Right of appeal against conviction cannot be curtailed But appellate court can impose condition for suspending sentence.
496.	Messers Pioneer Castings and another V. Employees State Insurance Corporation	Section 374(2) Appeal lies to Sessions Court and not HC.

497.	Sudhir Niranjana Chakre V. Rajesh Ramdas Wankhade 2014 ALL.M.R. (Cri) 4624	Section 374(4) and 2(wa) and 407(1)(c)(iv)_ Victim can appeal to Sessions Court and State to High Court against acquittal Parties can pray high court to transfer.
498.	The State of Maharashtra V. Hanmant Prabhakar Waidande and Ors. MANU-MH- 0868-2006	Section 378 Against acquittal appeal lies to sessions court in state case to high court in complaint case.
499.	State (Delhi Administration) V. Dharampal AIR 2001 SC 2924	Section 378 Limitation is 90 days for Appeal by complainant to HC against acquittal in Food Act case.
500.	Emperor V. Lakshman Chavji Narangikar AIR 1931 Bom 313	Section 381 Assistant and Additional Sessions Judges exercise jurisdiction of Sessions Court.
501.	K.S. Panduranga V. State of Karnataka AIR 2013 SC 2164	Section 384 to 386 Appeal once admitted - has to be decided on merits even in absence of accused.
502.	Kishori Lal V. Rupa and Ors. (2004) 7 SCC 638	Section 389 Appellate Court shall consider nature of allegations etc for granting bail.
503.	State of Punjab V. Deepak Mattu AIR 2008 SC 35	Section 389 High court recalled its order.
504.	Kishori Lal V. Rupa and Ors. (2004) 7 SCC 638	Section 389(1) Appellate Court shall consider nature of allegations etc for granting bail.
505.	Mayuram Subramanian Srinivasan V. C.B.I. AIR 2006 SC 2449	Section 389(3) is applicable only when there is right to appeal.
506.	Bondada Gajapathy Rao V. State of Andhra Pradesh AIR 1964 SC 1645	Section 394 Old Section 431 When appellant has died Appeal against fine only can be allowed to be continued but not against imprisonment.
507.	Raghu Raj Singh Rousha V. Shivam Sundaram Promoters (2009) 2 SCC 363	Section 397 against order refusing Section 156 directing for inquiry Accused to be impleaded.

508.	Hasmukh J. Jhaveri V. Shella Dadlani and Another 1981 Cri.L.J. 958	Section 397 and 146 Not interlocutory.
509.	Shivaji Vithalrao Bhikane V. Chandrasen Jagdevrao Deshmukh 2008 Cri.L.J. 3761	Section 397 and 156(3) Interference with order under Section 156(3) should normally be confined to cases in which there are some very exceptional circumstances.
510.	State of Kerala V. K.M. Charia Abdullah and Co. AIR 1965 SC 1585	Section 397 Distinction between Appeal and Revision.
511.	K. Chinnaswamy Reddy V. State of Andhra Pradesh AIR 1962 SC 1788	Section 397 Evidence Act Section 27 misinterpreted by appellate Court Rehearing ordered.
512.	Madhu Limaye V. The State of Maharashtra AIR 1978 SC 47	Section 397 Interlocutory order test Explained.
513.	D. Stephens V. Nosibolla AIR 1951 SC 196	Section 397 Jurisdiction not to be lightly exercised when invoked by a private complainant against an order of acquittal against which the Government has a right of appeal under section.
514.	Mohit alias Sonu and Anr. V. State of U.P. and Anr. MANU-SC-0633-2013	Section 397 Order which substantially affects the right of the accused, or decides certain rights of the parties cannot be said to be an interlocutory order.
515.	Raj Kapoor and Ors. V. State and Ors. AIR 1980 SC 258	Section 397 Petition under section 482 converted to revision.
516.	Mr. Joaquim Anthony D'Souza V. Mrs. Milinda Rosy D'Souza	Section 397 Revision against interim maintenace tenable.
517.	Yogesh V. The State of Maharashtra 2015 (1) Bom CR (Cri) 750	Section 397 Revision against order directing complainant to remain present for verification is not tenable
518.	Kaptan Singh and others V. State of M.P. and another AIR 1997 SC 2485	Section 397 Revision order setting aside acquittal and retrial direction upheld- I.O. findings not evidence.

519.	K.K. Patel and Anr. V. State of Gujarat and Anr. AIR 2000 SC 3346	Section 397 Test whether interlocutory or not.
520.	Madhu Limaye V. The State of Maharashtra AIR 1978 SC 47	Section 397 What is interim order is Explained.
521.	Kaptan Singh and others V. State of M.P. and another AIR 1997 SC 2485	Section 401 Scope of revision explained.
522.	Re. District and Sessions Judge Raisen 2005 (3) MP.L.J. 26	Section 409(2) Sessions Judge has power to transfer parheard sessions case without hearing.
523.	Mr. Parkar Hasan Abdul Gafoor V. State of Maharashtra & others 1999 (5) Bom CR 481	Section 413 Surety is not automatically discharged.
524.	Dhanapal V. State by Public Prosecutor 2009 Cri.L.J. 4647	Section 417 Criminal Appellate Court When can interfere.
525.	Shankar Kerba Jadhav and Ors. V. The State of Maharashtra AIR 1971 SC 840	Section 423(1) High Court set aside acquittal by sessions. It can exceed original sentence Appellate Courts Power of punishment.
526.	M.R. Kudva Appellant V. State Of Andhra Pradesh 2007 (1) Crimes 50 (SC)	Section 427 Concurrent plea has been rejected as offences were different.
527.	Sadashiv Chhokha Sable V. State Of Maharashtra 1993 Cri.L.J. 1469	Section 427 Cr.P.C. Undergoing sentence means explained.
528.	Bapurao Trimbakrao Sonawane V. The State of Maharashtra and The Superintendent of Police 2009 (111) BOM L.R. 1271	Section 427 Different cheques of same transaction with common notice can be trial at one trial.
529.	Rajendra B. Choudhari V. State Of Maharashtra And Anr 2007 Cri.L.J. 844	Section 427 Four cases of Section 138 NI Act consecutive sentence justified.

530.	Ammavasai and Anr V. Inspector of Police and Ors. AIR 2000 SC 3544	Section 427 Totality of sentence has been considered.
531.	Mohd. Akhtar Hussain @ Ibrahim Ahmed Bhatti V. Assistant Collector of Customs AIR 1988 SC 2143	Section 427 Totality of sentence has to be considered.
532.	Sadashiv Chhokha Sable V. State Of Maharashtra 1993 Cri.L.J. 1469	Section 427 Undergoing sentence means explained.
533.	M.R. Kudva V. State of Andhra Pradesh AIR 2007 SC 568	Section 427 Whether concurrent or consecutive has to be considered by the latter Court convicting.
534.	Narayanan Nambeesan V. The State of Maharashtra 1974 (76) BOM.L.R. 690	Section 428 Courts should specify the pre-conviction detention. Procedural law is retrospective gives benefit to all convicts.
535.	Shiv Mohan Singh V. The State (Delhi Administration) AIR 1977 SC 949	Section 428 Death sentence validity upheld.
536.	Namdeo @ Ram Krushna Khot V. The State of Maharashtra 2006 (6) Mh.L.J. 783	Section 428 Set off if not given simple misc. application is sufficient.
537.	State of Maharashtra and Anr. V. Najakat Alia Mubarak Ali AIR 2001 SC 2255	Section 428 Set off is entitled for the period of detention in the instant crime though during same period he was undergoing sentence in another case.
538.	Dinesh M.N. (S.P.) V. State of Gujarat AIR 2008 SC 2318	Section 429(2) Trial is not likely to be concluded in the near future or the period of incarceration would not be sufficient for granting bail.
539.	Swamy Shraddananda Murali Manohar Mishra V. State Of Karnataka on 22 July, 2008 by SC	Section 433 Life imprisonment with direction for rest of life.

540.	State of Haryana and Ors. V. Jagdish and Harpal AIR 2010 SC 1690	Section 433A For remission policy as on conviction date would prevail. If beneficial to convict policy as on date of consideration also applicable.
541.	Mulla and Anr. V. State of Uttar Pradesh AIR 2010 SC 942	Section 433A Life imprisonment is for 20 years unless directed otherwise.
542.	Rasiklal V. Kisore Khanchand Wadhvani AIR 2009 SC 1341	Section 436 Bail in bailable offences is rule.
543.	Salim Ikramuddin Ansari and Anr. V. Officer-in-Charge, Borivali Police Station and Ors. 2004 (4) Mh.L.J. 725	Section 436 Court to call information whether the accused was released on bail or not.
544.	Sukhwant Singh & Ors. V. State Of Punjab (2009) 7 SCC 559	Section 436 Interim Bail is inherent.
545.	Monit Malhotra V. The State of Rajasthan 1991 Cri.L.J. 806	Section 436 The accused in bailable offence bailed out by police need not apply to the Magistrate for fresh bail.
546.	Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre V. State of Maharashtra and Ors. AIR 2011 SC 312	Cr.P.C. S.436 to 450 Rules
547.	Sandeep Jain V. National Capital Territory of Delhi Rep. by Secretary, Home Deptt. (18.01.2000 - SC)	Section 437 Accused cannot be kept in jail for failure to make payment as per bail order.
548.	Uttam kumar V. The State of Maharashtra 2012 Bom C.R. (Cri) 697	Section 437 and 439 After bail police added life or death section Magistrate cannot release otherwise he can additional surety.
549.	Ambarish Rangshahi Patnigere V. The State Of Maharashtra 2012 (1) Mh.L.J. 900	Section 437 and I.P.C. Section 409 JMFC has power to grant bail.

550.	Central Bureau of Investigation V. Vijay Sai Reddy AIR 2013 SC 2216	Section 437 Bail cancelled accused rected to surrender.
551.	Rajesh Ranjan Yadav @ Pappu Yadav V. CBI	Section 437 Bail considerations.
552.	State of Maharashtra V. Kaushar Yasin Qureshi and another 1996 (2) Mh.L.J. 485	Section 437 Bail for Section 326 by Magistrate sustained, bail for Section 302 cancelled.
553.	Sundeep Kumar Bafna V. State of Maharashtra and Anr. 2014 (4) SCALE 215	Section 437 Before taking the accused into judicial custody there would be arrest.
554.	Nandini Bhatnagar V. State Govt. of NCT of Delhi (2013) DMC 495	Section 437 Condition not to go abroad without permission deleted.
555.	Km. Hema Mishra V. State of U.P. and Ors. AIR 2014 SC 1066	Section 437 High Court shall not direct subordinate to decide bail application on same day Interim bail is permissible,
556.	UP FB in Amarawati and Anr. V. State of U.P. 2005 Cri.L.J. 755	Section 437 High Court should ordinarily not direct any subordinate court to decide the bail application the same day.
557.	Sukhwant singh V. State of Punjab 2010 Cri.L.J. 1435 & (2009) 7 SCC 559	Section 437 Interim Bail is Inherent Power.
558.	The Balasaheb Satbhai Merchant V. The State Of Maharashtra 2012 Bom.C.R. (Cri) 841	Section 437 Magistrate can grant bail in Section 409 IPC as triable by himself held by Justice Potdar.
559.	Batta Hanuman Vishwanath Nehare V. State Of Maharashtra 2001 (3) Mh.L.J. 465	Section 437 Magistrate has no power of bail in life term cases held by Justice.

560.	Ramji V. State of Punjab MANU-PH-0150-2001	Section 437 Magistrate has power to grant bail in offences triable by him.
561.	Mr. Ishan Vasant Deshmukh @ Prasad Vasant Kulkarni V. The State of Maharashtra 2011 (2) Mh.L.J. 361	Section 437 Magistrate has power to grant bail in Section 409 and 467 IPC case.
562.	Ram Bharoshi and Ors. V. State of U.P. and Anr. 2004 (3) ACR 2563	Section 437 Magistrate has power to grant bail in sessions triable offence not punishable with life or death.
563.	Prahlad Singh Bhati V. N.C.T., Delhi AIR 2001 SC 1444	Section 437 Magistrate shall not grant bail in sessions triable offence Anticipatory bail for lessor offence.
564.	Jyoti Kaut Kohli V. State of Maharashtra	Section 437 Powers of Magistrate referred for larger bench.
565.	Dr. Raghubir Sharan V. The State of Bihar AIR 1964 SC 1	Section 437 Second Opinion -When medical reason is a ground for bail the Magistrate can call for detailed report from medical officer.
566.	Ganeshanan Lakshmanan and Anr. V. The State of Maharashtra MANU-MH-0345-2009	Section 437 Solvency Certificate need not be insisted for always.
567.	Dr. Raghubir Sharan V. The State of Bihar AIR 1964 SC 1	Section 437 When medical reason is a ground for bail the Magistrate can call for detailed report from medical officer.
568.	Santosh Bhaurao Raut V. State of Maharashtra 1989 Mh.L.J. 162	Section 437(1)(i) attracted even if the law prescribes death or imprisonment for life as the maximum.
569.	Bhagwat V. State of Maharashtra and Anr	Section 437(5) Cancellation of bail for breach of condition of attending police station was set aside.
570.	Union of India and others V. Major General Madan Lal Yadav AIR 1996 SC 1340	Section 437(6) Trial commences when the matter is posted for evidence.

571.	Balkrishna Mahadev Lad V. State of Maharashtra 2012 Bom.C.R. (Cri) 300	Section 437A and 390 Accused even after acquittal can be detained for not furnishing surety.
572.	Sareena, O.P. V. State of Kerala ILR 2013 (1) Kerala 537	Section 437A not mandatory.
573.	Rakesh Baban Borhade V. State of Maharashtra Decided on 19.11.2014	Section 438 Anticipatory bail cannot be granted as a rule but subject to satisfaction that the accused would not misuse.
574.	Asaram Sitaram Padole V. Yadaorao Raghobaji Hatwar & Ors. 1991 (93) BOM.L.R. 994	Section 438 Anticipatory bail continues till cancellation or trial is over.
575.	Narinderjit Singh Sahni and anr. V. Union of India and ors. (2002) 2 SCC 210	Section 438 Anticipatory bail refused in while collared crimes of cheating in numerous states.
576.	State State of Assam and Anr. V. Dr. Brojen Gogol and Ors. AIR 1997 SC 4101	Section 438 Application to be heard by the High Court having jurisdiction over the place of offence with notice to that.
577.	Sumit Mehta V. State of N.C.T. of Delhi	Section 438 Deposit condition deleted.
578.	Dr.Pradeep Kumar Soni V. State Of Madhya Pradesh on 13 March, 1990	Section 438 High Court not to grant anticipatory bail for crime in another state.
579.	Mukesh Kishanpuria V. State of West Bengal 2010 (4) SCALE 649	Section 438 Interim Bail -Grant of regular bail includes power to grant interim bail pending main application.
580.	Harjit Singh V. Union of India (UOI) and Ors. 1994 Cri.L.J. 3134	Section 438 Jurisdiction lies with the court having local jurisdiction.
581.	Dr. Pradeep Kumar Soni V. State of Madhya Pradesh 1990 Cri.L.J. 2055	Section 438 Jurisdiction lies with the court where offence took place.
582.	State of Assam and Anr. V. Dr. Brojen Gogol and Ors. AIR 1997 SC 4101	Section 438 Jurisdiction Application to be heard by the High Court having jurisdiction over the place of offence with notice to that State.

583.	Narinderjit Singh Sahni and anr. V. Union of India and ors.	Section 438 Not applicable to person already arrested and in prison.
584.	Shri Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia & Ors. V. State of Punjab AIR 1980 SC 1632	Section 438 When can anticipatory bail granted is explained.
585.	Niranjan Singh and Anr. V. Prabhakar Rajaram Kharote & Ors. AIR 1980 SC 785	Section 439 Appearance of accused before the Court amounts to custody.
586.	Anilkumar V. State Of Maharashtra On 15.11.1989	Section 439 Cancellation of bail.
587.	Anwari Begum V. Sher Mohammad and Anr. AIR 2005 SC 3530	Section.439 Factors to be considered for bail are discussed.
588.	Amarawati and Anr. V. State of U.P. 2005 Cri.L.J. 755	Section 439 Interim bail can be granted on the same day UP.
589.	Neeru Yadav V. State of U.P. 2014 (14) SCALE 59	Section 439 Parity ground is not absolute Antecedents of applicant may warrant rejection of bail.
590.	Niranjan Singh & Anr V. Prabhakar Rajaram Kharote & ors 1980 AIR 785	Section 439 Submitting to the Court also amounts to custody.
591.	Sundeeep Kumar Bafna V. State of Maharashtra and Anr. MANU-SC-0239-2014	Section 439 Surrender before Sessions Court and bail application.
592.	Dinesh Singh Arjun Singh V. State of U.P. and Pramod Singh Bhagwan Singh	Section 439(1) Bail order cancelled by High court itself.
593.	Jai Krishan V. The State of Punjab and Ors. 2010 (1) RCR (Criminal) 249 Punjab	Section 439(2) Bail obtained by fraud.

594.	Dinesh MN (SP) V. State Of Gujarat on 28 April, 2008	Section 439(2) Bail when to cancel.
595.	Puran, Shekhar And Anr V. Rambilas & Anr., State on 3 May, 2001	Section 439(2) Cancellation of bail Justified.
596.	Dr_ Narendra K Amin V. State Of Gujarat & Anr on 28 April, 2008	Section 439(2) When can the bail be Cancelled.
597.	State (Delhi Administration) V. Sanjay Gandhi AIR 1978 SC 961	Section 439(2) Bail can be cancelled on allegation of tampering Bombay case referred.
598.	Free Legal Aid Committee V. State of Bihar AIR 1982 SC 1463	Section 441(3) and 209 Bail bond is for appearance before Sessions Court.
599.	Mr. Sajal Kumar Mitra and Ors. V. The State of Maharashtra 2011 Cri.L.J. 2744	Section 445 Pending surety verification Magistrates has power to release accused on cash surety and thereafter asking him to furnish solvent sureties.
600.	Bhoja Babu Salian V. State Of Maharashtra 1983 (2) Bom.C.R. 165	Section 446 Forfeit first and then issue show cause notice to recover amount.
601.	Ghulam Mehdi V. State Of Rajasthan AIR 1960 SC 1185	Section 446 Show cause notice necessary.
602.	Divisional Forest Officer and Anr. V. G.V. Sudhakar Rao and Ors. MANU-SC-0069-1985	Section 451 and 452 explained in Forest Act Case.
603.	General Insurance Council & Ors. V. State of Andhra Pradesh and Ors. 2010 Cri.L.J. 2883	Section 451 and 457 Supreme Court directions regarding custody of seized properties.
604.	Delhi Excise Act State (NCT of Delhi) V. Narender MANU-SC-0010-2014	Section 451 Magistrate has no jurisdiction to release vehicle.

605.	State Bank of India V. Rajendra Kumar Singh and Ors. AIR 1969 SC 401	Section 451 Party adversely affected should be heard before the Court makes an order for return of the seized property.
606.	State of Karnataka V. K.A. Kunchindammed AIR 2002 SC 1875	Section 457 and Forest Act Magistrate has no jurisdiction to give interim custody.
607.	Navin Vasantraj Modh V. State of Maharashtra 2012 Bom.C.R. (Cri) 685	Section 457 Application was directed to be decided at the end.
608.	Prakash Tarachand Sakhre V. Ashok Pundloikrao Wajge and Anr. 2001 Cri.L.J. 3024	Section 457 When it is proved that T.T. forms were submitted non-transfer of registration of vehicle does not matter.
609.	Central Bureau of Investigation V. V.K. Sehgal AIR 1999 SC 3706	Section 465(2) Court to consider whether objection had raised objection PC Act Section 19.
610.	Japani Sahoo V. Chandra Sekhar Mohanty AIR 2007 SC 2762	Section 468 Date of filing complaint and not cognizance be counted.
611.	Limination Arun Vyas & Anr V. Anita Vyas on 14 May, 1999	Section 468 Limitaion Rational and Purpose behind.
612.	State Of Punjab V. Sarwan Singh 1981 SCALE (1) 619	Section 468(2) Bar of limitation on prosecutions was clearly to prevent the parties from filing cases after a long time.
613.	Jethmal Himmatmal Jain and Ors V. State of Maharashtra 1981 Cri.L.J. 1813	Section 473 Delay should be explained in the complaint or separate application and Court should pass speaking order.
614.	Rakesh Kumar Jain V. State Through CBI AIR 2000 SC 2754	Section 473 Delay stood explained.
615.	Mrs. Sarah Mathew V. The Institute of Cardio Vascular Diseases MANU-SC-1210-2013	Section 473 Notice to accused before taking cognizance is not contemplated.

616.	Kanwardeep singh Harban singh Bedi V. The State of Maharashtra 2010 Cri.L.J. 315	Section 475 and Court Martial (A.o.J) Rules, 1952 Notice to Commandant Necessary.
617.	Modilal Kaluram Kachhara and etc. V. State of Maharashtra MANU-MH-0041-1988	Section 482 Case transfer from one Magistrate to another Magistrate rejected.
618.	Abasaheb Yadav Honmane And V. The State Of Maharashtra on 12 March, 2008	Section 482 No compounding of noncompoundable offences.
619.	Harmanpreet Singh Ahluwalia & Ors V. State Of Punjab & Ors on 5 May, 2009	Section 482 When can FIR be quashed.
620.	Gian Singh V. State of Punjab and Anr. 2012 Bom.C.R. (Cri) 428	Section 482 Which offences can be Quashed.
621.	State of Gujarat V. Krushnmorari Ramkrushna Gupta and Ors (1988) 2 GLR 965	Pleading guilty After explaining charge Court should inform about minimum sentence unless special reasons are shown.
622.	The State Of Maharashtra V. Manik Mohan Gaikwad on 26 November, 2008	Cr.P.C. T.I. Parade and purpose No provision in Cr.P.C. which obliges investigation agency to hold identification parade.
623.	Human Rights Commission V. State of Gujarat and Ors. (2009) 6 SCC 342	Fair Trial and About Witnesses protection National.
624.	Ramesh Vithal Patil V. State of Karnataka and Ors. 2014 (2) Crimes 227 (SC)	IPC Section 304B and 498A conviction under Section 306.
625.	State of Maharashtra V. Vishwanath Tukaram Umale & Ors. AIR 1979 SC 1825	IPC Section 411 and Police Act Section 124 and Railway Property Act Section 3 Possession of property need not be necessarily a subsisting possession.

626.	Union of India (UOI) and Anr. V. B.N. Ananti Padmanabiah etc. AIR 1971 SC 1836	JMFC has jurisdiction throughout District.
627.	Madhav Raoji V. State AIR 1952 Bom 385	M.V. Act Old S.113 Conviction upheld though summons were served after 28 days.
628.	Ashok Gyanchand Vohra V. The State Of Maharashtra And Anr.	MCOCA Section 9 and 23 Private Complaint tenable.
629.	Kartar Singh V. State of Punjab (1994) 3 SCC 569	Mens rea and Law and Order and Pith and Substance.
630.	Sau Devakibai V. State of Maharashtra Bombay HC decided on 24.07.2014	M RTP Act Section 142 Prosecution not tenable for want of previous sanction.
631.	Ramesh V. State Of Rajasthan on 22 February, 2011	Murder of Money Lender Case.
632.	Association V. Union of India (UOI) Through its Secretary AIR 2011 Bom 171	PCPNDT Circular for online information was upheld Radiological and Imaging.
633.	Diwan Bhai V. Union of India and Ors. MANU DE 1823 2001	Plea not signed by accused no interference.
634.	Thomas Dana V. The State of Punjab AIR 1959 SC 375	Penalty and Punishment difference.
635.	Champaklal Ganeshmal V. The State of Maharashtra AIR 1975 SC 160	Police Act Section 124 Possession of foreign made wrist watches unexplained Hence conviction upheld.
636.	Aher Raja Khima V. The State Of Maharashtra on 22 December, 1955	Police Credibility.
637.	The State Of Maharashtra And Etc. V. Saeed Sohail Sheikh Etc. On 2 November, 2012	Prisoners Act Section 29(2) Not applicable to undertrial prisoners.

638.	Sidhartha Vashisht @ Manu Sharma ROLE OF PROSECUTOR	Prosecutor's role explained and Delay in recording the statement of the witnesses do not necessarily discredit their testimonies.
639.	Shri Sandeep Indravadan Sagar V. State of Maharashtra and others decided on 10.01.2013	Rubber stamp use-mentioned.
640.	The Food Inspector V. M. Pandarinath and Anr. 1992 (2) AP.L.J. 396	Sanction and Consent Explained.
641.	Hardeep Singh Sohal V. State of Punjab (2004) 11 SCC 612	TADA Section 15(1) Confession cannot be used against coaccused in other than joint trial.



-By Adv. Abhishek Gupta



Delhi High Court

Mobile: 9999052336

Email: adv.abhishek3995@gmail.com