

CR.P.C. CASE LAWS

The State of Bihar vs Chandra Bhushan Singh & Ors. AIR 2001 Supreme Court 429	Cr.P.C. S.2(d) Charge sheet by RPF officer for offence under Railway Property Act can be treated as complaint of the RPF
Attiq-Ur-Rehman Vs.Municipal Corporation of Delhi and anotherAIR1996SC1267	Cr.P.C. S.4 In absence of special court the regular court can try the offence
Thomas DanaVs.The State of PunjabAIR1959SC375	Cr.P.C. S.4 The words Punishment and Penalty are explained in
Republic of Italy thr. Ambassador and Ors.Vs.Union of India (UOI) and Ors.2013(1)SCALE462	Cr.P.C. S.4 Union Govt was directed to constitute special court
Pankajbhai Nagjibhai Patelvs.The State of Gujarat and Anr.AIR2001SC567	Cr.P.C. S.4(2) When the special statute does not prescribe procedure Cr.P.C. is applicable
In Re_ Sikandarkhan Mahomedkhan 1920(22)BOMLR200	Cr.P.C. S.9 Additional Sessions Judge can hear appeal
EmperorVs.Lakshman Chavji NarangikarAIR1931Bom313	Cr.P.C. S.9(3) 194 and 409 Assistant and Additional Sessions Judges exercise jurisdiction of Sessions Court but they are separate Courts
Praphakar Vs. The State of Maha 2012 Cri.L.J.4726	Cr.P.C. S.28 Assistant Sessions Judge should not be allotted with case punishable with more than 10 years
Pankajbhai Nagjibhai Patel vs The State Of Gujarat AIR 2001 SC 567	Cr.P.C. S.29 and S.138 NI Act Magistrate has no pecuniary limit for compensation
Pankajbhai Nagjibhai Patel vs The State Of Gujarat AIR 2001 SC 567	Cr.P.C. S.29 Magistrate has no pecuniary limit for compensation
Shidlingappa GurulingappaVs.EmperorAIR1926Bom416	Cr.P.C. S.31 Aggregate fine should be considered for the purpose of appeal
Chatar Singh vs State Of M.P.AIR2007SC319	Cr.P.C. S.31 Aggregate sentence not to exceed 14 years when consecutive SC says
Hariom @ Kalicharan Shiriram and anr Vs. the State of Maharashtra 1994(2) Bom C.R.219	Cr.P.C. S.31 and 427(1) Accused convicted in 3 cases His sentence of 22 years brought down by giving concurrence in two cases
Emperor vs Piru Rama Havaladar27 BOMLR 1371	Cr.P.C. S.31 and IPC S.71 separate sentences are subject to the provisions of Section 71, Indian Penal Code
Jagat Bahadur Singh Jagat Bahadur Singh Vs.State of Madhya Pradesh, AIR 1966 SC 945	Cr.P.C. S.31 Appellate court can inflict the Trial Court's limited punishment only

Reg.Vs.Tukaya Bin TamanaILR1875 1 Bom 214	Cr.P.C. S.31 For S.457 and 380 IPC Sentence may be either for both or for one but should not greater
Sunil Anandrao Sawant vs Government Of Maharashtra 2010CriLJ3579	Cr.P.C. S.31 Separate sentence to run consecutive after life has been discussed
Nanak ChandVs.The State of PunjabAIR1955SC274	Cr.P.C. S.34 AND 149 Distinction is explained
detention D.K. Basu Vs State of West Bengal AIR 1997 SC 610	Cr.P.C. S.41 and Constitution A.21 Directions w.r.t. arrest and
R.P. VaghelaVs.State of Gujarat2002CriLJ3082	Cr.P.C. S.41 and Contempt of Courts Act S.10 Mere handcuffing without prior permission, in justifiable circumstances does not amount to contempt
Afak Shabbir Khan vs The State Of Maharashtra & Anr 2013BomCR(Cri)242(DB)	Cr.P.C. S.41 Mentioning reasons in the arrest panchanama is held sufficient compliance of recording reasons for arrest
Arnesh KumarVs.State of BiharAIR2014SC2756	Cr.P.C. S.41(1) and 41A and S.498A of IPC Directions to police and Magistrates
ManikandanVs.S. I. of Police, Nallalam Police Stn2008CriLJ1338	Cr.P.C. S.41(1)(d) Accused needs to bailed or not is discussed
Joginder KumarVs.State of U.P. and Ors.(1994)4SCC260	Cr.P.C. S.56(1) Magistrate to ensure compliance of directions given
Jayendragiri Anandgiri GoswamiVs.Narcotics Control Bureau and Anr.2005CriLJ3190	Cr.P.C. S.57 Accused in NCB custody arrested in another crime should be produced before magistrate within 24 hours
Gajanan P. Lasure Vs. The Director General of Police and ors 2009(4) Mh.L.J.399	Cr.P.C. S.57 and deemed suspension of accused public servant
Raghuvansh Dewanchand BhasinVs.State of Maharashtra and AnrAIR2011SC3393	Cr.P.C. S.70 and 71 No Arrest on cancelled warrant. Warrant register be maintained
State Through Cbi vs Dawood Ibrahim Kaskar AIR1997SC2494	Cr.P.C. S.73 Warrant can be issued before charge sheet and for investigation purpose
Shaikh RahemanVs.State of Maharashtra1991(1)BomCR263	Cr.P.C. S.79 Magistrate can issue warrant for execution beyond his local jurisdiction
M.P. Sharma and Ors.Vs.Satish ChandraAIR1954SC300	Cr.P.C. S.93 and 94 Search and Seizure from accused not violative of fundamental rights
State of GujaratVs.Shyamlal Mohanlal Choksi MANU-SC-0383-1964	Cr.P.C. S.94 is not applicable to accused
State of Gujarat Vs. Shyamlal Mohanlal Choksi AIR 1965 SC 1251	Cr.P.C. S.94(1) Power to issue summons to produce document is not applicable to accused

Pravinsingh and another Vs. Biharilal Singh and another 1989 Cri LJ 1386) (Bom)	Cr.P.C. S.97 Search can be conducted in a place other than mentioned in warrant
State Govt. of NCT of Delhi Vs. Sunil and Another, 2001 Cri.L.J. 504	Cr.P.C. S.100 and S.27 Evi Act Witnesses not required
Khet Singh Vs Union of India (UOI) AIR 2002 SC 1450	Cr.P.C. S.100 Seizure panchanama prepared at customs office instead of spot did not cause prejudice Hence relied
State Of Maharashtra & Ors. Vs. Sudhir Vasant Karnataki Etc. Etc. MANU-SCOR-47069-2014	Cr.P.C. S.100 Whether immovable property is included or not referred to larger bench
State Govt. of NCT of Delhi Vs. Sunil and Another 2001 Cri LJ 504	Cr.P.C. S.100(5) and Evi Act S.27 Witnesses is not required
Bombay HC Full bench Sudhir Vasant Karnataki Vs. The State of Maharashtra 2011 (1) Bom.C.R. (Cri.) 326 _ 2011 ALL MR (Cri) 96	Cr.P.C. S.102(1) Property does not include immovable property
Sunder Singh vs State Of Uttar Pradesh AIR 1956 SC 411	Cr.P.C. S.103 Applicable to search of a place and not of a person. Hence, independent witnesses not necessary
Suresh Nanda Vs. C.B.I. AIR 2008 SC 1414	Cr.P.C. S.104 Passport can be impounded by Passport Authority and not by Police
The State of Maharashtra and Anr. Vs. Mangali Dewaiyya Pupalla 1994 Mh LJ 483	Cr.P.C. S.107 and 116 No provision to ask for interim bond
Rajesh Suryabhan Nayak Vs. The State of Maharashtra 2006(5) Mh LJ 243	Cr.P.C. S.107 and 123 No interim bond and CJM reduced bond
Pramila Navin Shah Vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors 2005(15) Criminal CC 1051	Cr.P.C. S.107 No provision to ask for interim bond
Dattatraya Mahadu Tikkal Vs. The State of Maharashtra 2014(1) Bom CR (Cri) 439	Cr.P.C. S.107 Sessions Judge has to interfere if action is illegal
Pravin Vijaykumar Taware, Vs. The Special Executive Magistrate 2009(111) BOMLR 3166	Cr.P.C. S.116 Training to Executive Magistrates directed by High Court
Rajesh Suryabhan Nayak Vs. The State of Maharashtra, 2006(5) Mh LJ 243	Cr.P.C. S.123(2) and (3) CJM exercised jurisdiction
Noor Saba Khatoon Vs. Mohd. Quasim AIR 1997 SC 3280	Cr.P.C. S.125 and S.3 of MWPOD Act Rights of minor children and unmarried daughter are protected
Mohd. Ahmed Khan Vs. Shah Bano Begum and Ors AIR 1985 SC 945	Cr.P.C. S.125 applicable to Muslim divorced women also

Allabuksh Karim Shaikh Vs. Smt. Noorjahan Allabuksh Shaikh and another 1994 MhLJ 1376	Cr.P.C. S.125 application for muslim child is tenable
Smt. Saroj Govind Mukkavar Vs. Smt. Chandrakalabai Polshetwar 2009(4) MhLj 665	Cr.P.C. S.125 Daughter in law was directed to maintain mother in law
Nandlal Wasudeo Badwaik Vs. Lata Nandlal Badwaik and Anr. AIR 2014 SC 932	Cr.P.C. S.125 DNA Test prevails over the presumption
Bakulabai and Anr. Vs. Gangaram and Anr. (1988) 1 SCC 537	Cr.P.C. S.125 Illegitimate child is entitled for maintenance
Jaiminiben Hiren bhai Vyas Vs. Hiren bhai Rameshchandra Vyas Decided On_ 19.11.2014	Cr.P.C. S.125 Judgment shall contain reasons for finding for grant of maintenance from the date of application
Jagdish Jugtawat Vs. Manju Lata and Ors. (2002) 5 SCC 422	Cr.P.C. S.125 Maintenance by Family Court to major daughter was upheld
Shivaji Baburao Bhabad @ Bhawad Vs. Sau. Alka Shivaji Bhabad Criminal Writ Petition No. 955 of 2009 decided on 14.01.2010	Cr.P.C. S.125 Major son is not entitled for maintenance
Jagir Singh Vs. Ranbir Singh and Anr. AIR 1979 SC 381	Cr.P.C. S.125 Major son though student is not entitled for maintenance from father
Chinnappaiyan Chellandi Vs. Chinnathayee Chinnappaiyan 2010(1) Crimes 835	Cr.P.C. S.125 Permission granted to amend petition
Sau. Manda R. Thaore Vs. Sh. Ramaji Ghanshyam Thaore Criminal Revision Application No. 317-2006 Decided On_ 20.04.2010	Cr.P.C. S.125 Second wives maintenance rejected but compensation granted in revision
Syed Mohsin Ali Syed Shaukat Ali Vs. Smt. Noorus Saher MANU-MH-0996-2005	Cr.P.C. S.125 Talaq must be for reasonable cause and be preceded by attempts at reconciliation
Savitaben Somabhai Bhatiya Vs. State of Gujarat and Ors. AIR 2005 SC 1809	Cr.P.C. S.125 Woman married by Hindu man having living spouse is not entitled for maintenance
Shantha @ Ushadevi and Anr. Vs. B.G. Shivananjappa AIR 2005 SC 2410	Cr.P.C. S.125(3) Successive applications are unnecessary and Limitation is not barred when the arrears upto date are included by interim application
Rajesh Bhiwaji Nande Vs. State of Maharashtra and Ors. 2005(2) MhLj 977	Cr.P.C. S.125(3) Successive orders of one month imprisonment upheld
Dalip Singh Vs. Rajbala II (2007) DMC 273	Cr.P.C. S.125(4) Adultery defence not applicable after divorce

Dalip SinghVs.RajbalaII(2007)DMC273	Cr.P.C. S.125(4) Adultery not applicable to divorcee
Gita Vs. Chandrasekhar	Cr.P.C. S.125(4) Divorced on cruelty ground is till entitled for maintenance
M. Chinna KaruppasamyVs.Kanimozhi2015ALLMR(Cri)615	Cr.P.C. S.125(4) includes adultery by divorced wife
Chanda Preetam WadateVs.Preetam Ganpatrao Wadate 2002(2)MhLj482	Cr.P.C. S.125(4) Isolated instance of adultery is not sufficient to deny maintenance
Vanamala (Smt)Vs.H.M. Ranganatha Bhatta(1995)5SCC299	Cr.P.C. S.125(4) Wife does not include divorcee
Ashok Yeshwant SamantVs.Smt. Suparna Ashok Samant and another1991CriLJ766	Cr.P.C. S.127(1) Precondition to deposit arrears cannot be put
Ahmed Noormohmed BhattiVs.State of Gujarat and Ors.AIR2005SC2115	Cr.P.C. S.151 is not ultravires merely because it can be misused
Rajesh Ramrao Raut Vs. The State of Maharashtra and Ors. 2003 Cri.L.J	Cr.P.C. S.151(3)_
Anju ChaudharyVs.State of U.P. and Anr.2013CriLJ776	Cr.P.C. S.154 and 156(3) If the offence is same there cannot be two FIRs. Magistrate can treat application as a complaint
Satvinder Kaur Vs.State (Govt. of N.C.T. of Delhi)AIR1999SC3596	Cr.P.C. S.154 and 177 The IO can forward the FIR to the police station having jurisdiction if the offence was beyond own jurisdictiono
UshabenVs.Kishorbhai Chunilal Talpada and Ors.2012ACR1859	Cr.P.C. S.154 and 198A Police can investigate S.494 with 498A of IPC as S.498A is cognizable
GaneshaVs.Sharanappa and anr.AIR2014SC1198	Cr.P.C. S.154 and 354 The person who lodges the FIR be called the Informant and not the Complainant
M. Narayandas vs State Of Karnataka And Ors.,2004 Cri.L.J. 822,	Cr.P.C. S.154 FIR reasonableness or Credibility of the said information is not a condition precedent for registration of a case
BabubhaiVs.State of Gujarat and Ors.(2010)12SCC254	Cr.P.C. S.154 For deciding tenability of two FIRs sameness test should be applied
Ashi Devi and Ors.Vs.State (NCT of Delhi)MANU-SC-0526-2014	Cr.P.C. S.154 In a 9 years old theft case held that mere delay itself is not a ground to discard a case
Gosu Jayarami Reddy Vs. State of A.P. (2011) 11 SCC 766	Cr.P.C. S.154 Overwriting limited to converting 4 to 5 in FIR is immaterial.

GaneshaVs.Sharanappa and anr.2014(11)SCALE541	Cr.P.C. S.154 Person who lodges FIR is called Informant and who files complaint is called complainant
Mrs. Charu Kishor Mehta and etc.Vs.State of Maharashtra and Anr.2011CriLJ1486	Cr.P.C. S.154 Police cannot refuse to register the F.I.R. under the pretext of preliminary inquiry when cognizable offences are made out
KumariVs.Govt. of U.P. and Ors.2014CriLJ470	Cr.P.C. S.154 Police is bound to register F.I.R. Lalita
Satish Narayan SawantVs.State of Goa2009CriLJ4655	Cr.P.C. S.154 police officer going to the place of occurrence to make some survey does not amount to making an investigation doc.
Mrs. Charu Kishor MehtaVs.State of Maharashtra and Addl. Commissioner of PoliceDecided On_ 00.11.2010	Cr.P.C. S.154 Police shall register FIR instead of ignoring as civil dispute
Sone Lal And Ors AIR 1978 SC 1142	Cr.P.C. S.154 Recording FIR is an official act and has such presumption
Charu Kishor Mehta and etc. etc.Vs.State of Maharashtra and Anr.2011CriLJ1486	Cr.P.C. S.154 Reliability genuineness and credibility of the information are not the conditions precedent Mrs.
Samaj Parivartan Samudaya and Ors. vs. State of Karnataka and Ors	Cr.P.C. S.154
M. Narayandas vs State Of Karnataka And Ors.,2004 Cri.L.J. 822	Cr.P.C. S.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
Surender Kaushik and Ors.Vs.State of Uttar Pradesh and Ors.AIR2013SC3614	Cr.P.C. S.154 There cannot be two FIRs of the same person of same incident
Surender Kaushik and Ors.Vs.State of Uttar Pradesh and Ors.AIR2013SC3614	Cr.P.C. S.154 When a FIR is already there sameness test shall be used for the subsequent FIRs
State Of Haryana And Ors vs Ch. Bhajan Lal And Ors1992 AIR 604	Cr.P.C. S.154 When can the Court pass appropriate orders
Satish Narayan SawantVs.State of Goa2009CriLJ4655	Cr.P.C. S.154 When information was cryptic the police officer going to the place of occurrence to make some survey is not an investigation
Pravin Chandra ModyVs.State of Andhra PradeshAIR1965SC1185	Cr.P.C. S.155 Police can investigate a non-cognizable offence under EC Act along with S.420 IPC

Dashrath Kishan Kotkar and Anr.Vs.State of Maharashtra1986MhLJ986	Cr.P.C. S.155(2) and (3) Once permission is obtained the procedure applicable to cognizable offences is applicable
Vithal Puna Koli (Shirsath) and Ors. Vs. The State of Maharashtra-MH-0633-2006	Cr.P.C. S.155(2) Obtaining Magistrate's permission is necessary
State of Maharashtra vs. Dharmendra Ambar Mohite (10.09.1998 - BOMHC)	Cr.P.C. S.155(2) permission was not obtained Hence prosecution for offence of S.145 Police Act was held untenable
MukhedkarVs.The State of Maharashtra,1983CriLJ1833	Cr.P.C. S.155(2) Prosecution for S.124 of Bom Police Act quashed for want of permission Avinash Madhukar
Shivaji Vithalrao Bhikane Vs.Chandrasen Jagdevrao Deshmuk 2008CriLJ376	Cr.P.C. S.156 and 397 156(3) of Cr.PC merely mean that an alleged cognizable offence should be investigated
Atul Son of Shridhar KapleVs.State of Maharashtra, through Police Station Officer2011 113 BOMLR1549	Cr.P.C. S.156 S.173(3) and s.190(1)(c).
Sakiri VasuState of U.P. and others and other cases MANY CASES	Cr.P.C. S.156
Pravin Chandra ModyVs.State of Andhra PradeshAIR1965SC1185	Cr.P.C. S.156(1) and 173 Police officer can investigate E.C. Act offence along with S.420
Sheshrao and Ors.Vs.The State of Maharashtra and Ors.24.07.2015	Cr.P.C. S.156(1) Charge sheet quashed for want of jurisdiction
Satvinder Kaur Vs.State (1999)8SCC728	Cr.P.C. S.156(2) Police can investigate any cognizable offence and to submit charge sheet before competent court
Alpic Finance Ltd.vsP. Sadasivan and Anr.AIR2001SC1226	Cr.P.C. S.156(3) and IPC S.420 It must also be shown that there existed a fraudulent and dishonest intention at the time of commission of the offence
Vinay TyagiVs.Irshad Ali @ Deepak and Ors. 2013CriLJ754	Cr.P.C. S.156(3) and 173(8) Kinds of order under S.156(3) are (i) Initial Investigation, (ii) Further Investigation, (iii) Fresh or de novo or re-investigation-Detail
Gopal Das Sindhi and Ors.Vs.The State of Assam and Anr.1961CriLJ39(3JJs)	Cr.P.C. S.156(3) and 190 Passing order of S.156(3) or Search Warrant is not taking Cognizance
(R.R. Chari etc followed)Gopal Das Sindhi and Ors.Vs.The State of Assam and Anr.1961CriLJ39	Cr.P.C. S.156(3) and 190 Taking Cognizance on complaint means verification etc.

Nirmaljit Singh HoonVs.The State of West BengalAIR1972SC2639	Cr.P.C. S.156(3) and 200 Cognizance means not mere applying mind but for the purpose of proceeding under S.200 and following provisions
SachinVs.The State of Maharashtra2014ALLMR(Cri)1833	Cr.P.C. S.156(3) and 200 Magistrate has discretion to reject the prayer and direct for verification etc.
Ramdev Food Products Private LimitedVs. State of Gujarat2015(3)SCALE622	Cr.P.C. S.156(3) and 202 No arrest in investigation of S.202
Raghu Raj Singh RoushaVs.Shivam Sundaram Promoters ((2009)2SCC363	Cr.P.C. S.156(3) and 397 Accused shall be impleaded in a revision against order refusing S.156
Shivaji Vithalrao BhikaneVs.Chandrasen Jagdevrao Deshmuk2008CriLJ3761	Cr.P.C. S.156(3) and 398 Interference in revision should be in exceptional cases
Vasanti DubeyVs.State ofMadhya Pradesh2012CriLJ1309	Cr.P.C. S.156(3) and S.7 P.C. Act
Syed Muzaffaruddin Khan Mohd. Vs. . Mohd.Abdul Qadir Mohd. Abdul. 2012 Bom C R(Cri) 375	Cr.P.C. S.156(3) and S.195 and S.341 Magistrate can order S.156(3) and after investigation he can file complaint
Shivaji Vithalrao Bhikane Vs.Chandrasen Jagdevrao Deshmukh2008CriLJ3761	Cr.P.C. S.156(3) and S.397 Direction by sessions judge for sending signature to the expert set aside
U.P. HC in Chandrika SinghVs.State of U.P2007CriLJ3169	Cr.P.C. S.156(3) application can be treated as complaint
Mrs Priyanka Srivastava & Anr. Vs. State of UP & Ors2015 (96) SCC 287	Cr.P.C. S.156(3) Application should be supported by affidavit
Shivaji Vithalrao BhikaneVs.Chandrasen Jagdevrao Deshmukh2008CriLJ3761	Cr.P.C. S.156(3) Before the order complainant cannot be asked to call experto to prove forgery
Mohd. YousufVs.Smt. Afaq Jahan and Anr.AIR2006SC705	Cr.P.C. S.156(3) Complainant should not be examined before order under this section
Srinivas Gundluri and Ors.Vs.SEPCO(2010)8SCC206	Cr.P.C. S.156(3) Difference of s.156(3) and 202 Cr.P.C. Mere direction to file charge sheet not illegal
Upkar SinghVs.Ved Prakash and Ors.AIR2004SC4320	Cr.P.C. S.156(3) Direction to register counter FIR is valid
Madhubala Vs. Sureshkumar AIR1997SC3104	Cr.P.C. S.156(3) Format of order
Anju ChaudharyVs.State of U.P. and Anr.2013CriLJ776	Cr.P.C. S.156(3) Magistrate can treat an application as a complaint In more than one FIRs sameness test has to be applied

CBI Central Bureau Of Investigation vs State Of Gujarat MANU-GJ-0573-2001	Cr.P.C. S.156(3) Magistrate cannot direct
Central Bureau of Investigation through S.P., Jaipur vs. State of Rajasthan & Anr. AIR 2001 SC 668	Cr.P.C. S.156(3) Magistrate cannot direct the CBI investigation
K. Selvaraj Vs. The Superintendent of Police and The Inspector of Police	Cr.P.C. S.156(3) Magistrate cannot order investigation by the CBI
Sachin Raosaheb Jadhav Vs State of Maharashtra Justice Nalawade	Cr.P.C. S.156(3) Magistrate has discretion not to refer to police and to inquire himself into the application
Sukhwasi son of Hulasi Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh 2008 Cri.L.J.472	Cr.P.C. S.156(3) Magistrate has discretion to send or not to send for investigation
Nilesh Daulatrao Lakhani Vs. State of Maharashtra 2014(4) Bom CR (Cri) 757	Cr.P.C. S.156(3) No cognizance on police report after first directing for inquiry
R.P. Kapur vs. S.P. Singh AIR 1961 SC 1117	Cr.P.C. S.156(3) No order to CBI by Magistrate
Blue Dart Express Ltd. Vs. The State of Maharashtra 2011(2) Crimes 46	Cr.P.C. S.156(3) order after verification was set aside and directed to proceed
Yogiraj Vasant Rao Surve Vs. State of Maharashtra 2013 ALL MR (Cri) 2059	Cr.P.C. S.156(3) order can be challenged in Revision
R.R. Chari Vs. The State of Uttar Pradesh, AIR 1951 SC 207	Cr.P.C. S.156(3) Order does not amount to taking cognizance 3 Judges Bench
Basanthi Sarkar and Ors. Vs. State of West Bengal and Ors. MANU-WB-0218-2010	Cr.P.C. S.156(3) order in S.193 IPC offence upheld by Kolkata HC
General Officer Commanding Vs. CBI and Anr. AIR 2012 SC 1890	Cr.P.C. S.156(3) order is not taking cognizance
Shivaji Vithalrao Bhikane Vs. Chandrasen 2008 Cri LJ 3761	Cr.P.C. S.156(3) Orders interference by superior Courts normally be in very exceptional circumstances
Ajit Ramrao Thete and others Vs. the State of Maharashtra and another Bombay (DB)	Cr.P.C. S.156(3) Original Complaint and order should be retained in Court
Mohd. Yousuf Vs. Smt. Afaq Jahan and Anr. 2006(1) KLJ 380	Cr.P.C. S.156(3) Petition's Format and nomenclature is not material It can be treated as complaint
Samaj Parivartan Samudaya and Ors. Vs. State of Karnataka and Ors. AIR 2012 SC 2326	Cr.P.C. S.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
Laxminarayan Vishwanath Arya The State of Maharashtra through Senior Inspector of Police and Ors. Vs. 2008 Cri LJ 1	Cr.P.C. S.156(3) Police need not seek permission of Magistrate to arrest accused

Raghu Raj Singh Rousha Vs. Shivam Sundaram Promoters (P) L and Anr. (2009) 2 SCC 363	Cr.P.C. S.156(3) Refusing direction for investigation and direction for verification and statements is taking cognizance
Karnataka HC Sri. B.V. Acharya, Vs. Sri. N. Venkateshaiah	Cr.P.C. S.156(3) Sanction needed for even order under section
Mr. Panchabhai Popotbhai Butani, Vs. The State of Maharashtra 2010 Cri.L.J. 2723	Cr.P.C. S.156(3) Simplificator application without FIR is tenable
Pinni Co-op Housing Society and others Maruti Mathu Gaikwad and others Bom DB dd on 02.07.2013 CRAPPLN463510	Cr.P.C. S.156(3) This section cannot be resorted to after direction to put up for verification
Sakiri Vasu Vs. State of U.P. and Ors. AIR 2008 SC 907	Cr.P.C. S.156(3) When can Magistrate Monitor investigation
Maksud Saiyed Vs. State of Gujarat and Ors. (2008) 5 SCC 668	Cr.P.C. S.156(3) While passing the order the Magistrate has to apply mind
Rasiklal Dalpatram Thakkar Vs. State of Gujarat and Ors. AIR 2010 SC 715	Cr.P.C. S.156(5) and 181(4) Jurisdiction to be of the JMFC and not of the PSO
Mr. Panchabhai Popotbhai Butani Vs. The State of Maharashtra 2010 CriLJ 2723	Cr.P.C. S.156(6) Application without prior F.I.R. tenable
(2009) 6 SCC 576	Cr.P.C. S.156(6) No inherent power to recall order
State rep. by Inspector of Police, Vigilance and Anti-Corruption, Tiruchirapalli, Tamil Nadu vs. V. Jayapaul (22.03.2004 - SC) (2004) 5 SCC 223	Cr.P.C. S.157 No statutory bar to the informant-police officer for taking up the investigation
The State of Uttar Pradesh Vs. Bhagwant Kishore Joshi AIR 1964 SC 221	Cr.P.C. S.157 and PC Act Investigation can be started on information or otherwise means without FIR
S.N. Sharma Vs. Bipen Kumar Tiwari and Ors. AIR 1970 SC 786	Cr.P.C. S.159 does not enable Magistrate to stop investigation
S.N. Sharma Vs. Bipen Kumar Tiwari and Ors. AIR 1970 SC 786	Cr.P.C. S.159 Gives limited power to Magistrate to direct investigate proceed himself but no power to stop investigation
S.N. Sharma Vs. Bipen Kumar Tiwari and Ors. AIR 1970 SC 786	Cr.P.C. S.159 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)
Ashok Debbarma Vs. State of Tripura (2014) 4 SCC 747	Cr.P.C. S.161 and 154 Omission to name accused when he was part of group is not fatal
State of N.C.T. of Delhi Vs. Mukesh (2013) 2 SCC 58	Cr.P.C. S.161 and 162 and Evi Act S.145 Statement on TV channel subsequent to

	charge sheet is not covered Bipin Panchal distinguished
Mahesh Janardhan Gonnade Vs. State of Maharashtra (2008) 13 SCC 271	Cr.P.C. S.161 and 164 Testimony of I.O. and Spl Judl. Magi. cannot be disbelieved and discredited
Ashok Debbarma @ Achak Debbarma Vs. State of Tripura (2014) 4 SCC 747	Cr.P.C. S.161 Every omission is not contradiction
State of Gujarat Vs. Kathi Ramku Alighbai 1986 Cri LJ 239	Cr.P.C. S.161 Inadmissible portions in the panchana should be marked by the APP and excluded by the Juge and How to appreciate witnesses
State of U.P. Vs. M.K. Anthony AIR 1985 SC 48. Anthony AIR 1985 SC 48	Cr.P.C. S.161 Signature of witness does not render evidence inadmissible
Nirpal Singh and Ors. Vs. State of Haryana AIR 1977 SC 1066	Cr.P.C. S.161 Statement of witness need not be there in inquest panchanama
Gujarat High Court Full Bench Nathu Manchhu Vs. The State of Gujarat 1978 Cri LJ 448	Cr.P.C. S.161 Statement reading over to witness does not make his evidence inadmissible
Suresh Vs. The State of Maharashtra (DB) Decided On_ 31.10.2014	Cr.P.C. S.161 Statement should not be read over to the witness by the police
Md. Ankoos and Ors. Vs. The Public Prosecutor, High Court of A.P. AIR 2010 SC 566	Cr.P.C. S.161(3) Statement cannot be used
Dr. Sunil Clifford Daniel Vs. State of Punjab (2012) 11 SCC 205	Cr.P.C. S.161_ In view of exception of S.162(2) to S.161, statement of accused under S.27 Evi Act need not be signed by accused.
State of Kerala Vs. Babu & Ors AIR 1999 SC 2161	Cr.P.C. S.162 and 161 and 91 Magistrate can call case diary of another case
Mr. Prakash Vernekar Vs. State of Goa 2007 Cri LJ 4649	Cr.P.C. S.162 and 452 and S.27 not barred for deciding custody of muddemal
Mr. Prakash Vernekar Vs. State of Goa 2007 Cri.L.J. 4649	Cr.P.C. S.162 and S.27 Statement is not barred for deciding custody of muddemal
Pakala Narayana Swami Vs. Emperor AIR 1939 PC 47	Cr.P.C. S.162 Any confession made to a police officer in course of investigation whether a discovery is made or not is excluded
Khatri and Ors. Vs. State of Bihar and Ors. AIR 1981 SC 1068	Cr.P.C. S.162 Bar is not applicable in civil or other proceeding

Tahsildar Singh and Anr.Vs.The State of Uttar PradeshAIR1959SC1012	Cr.P.C. S.162 Contradictions an omissions
Ramkishan Mithanlal SharmaVs.The State of BombayAIR1955SC104	Cr.P.C. S.162 covers statements to police during TIP
George & Ors vs State Of Kerala (1998) 4 SCC 605	Cr.P.C. S.162 Statement of I.O. in the inquest what he saw is admissible
State of Karnataka by Nonavinakere PoliceVs.Shivanna @ Tarkari Shivanna 2014(3)BomCR(Cri)98 (2014(3)BomCR(Cri)98)	Cr.P.C. S.164 and IPC S.376 Directions to Police and Magistrates
	Cr.P.C. S.164 and S.30 Evi Act Recording confession by other than jurisdiction Magistrate upheld
AIR1981SC1165	Cr.P.C. S.164 and S.80 Evidence Act SC says Magistrate need not be examined Madi Ganga
The State of MaharashtraVs.Prakash Dhawal Khairnar1997BomCR(Cri)367	Cr.P.C. S.164 Confession
Dhananjaya Reddy etc.vs.State of KarnatakaAIR2001SC1512	Cr.P.C. S.164 Confession without signature of accused inadmissible
Abdul Razak ShaikhVs.State of Maharashtra1987MhLJ863	Cr.P.C. S.164 Signature of accused is mandatory Bom. DB
Abdul_Razak_Shaikh_vs_State_Of_Maharashtra_on_7_August,_1987	Cr.P.C. S.164 Signature of accused on confession Mandatory
State of Karnataka by Nonavinakere PoliceVs.Shivanna @ Tarkari Shivanna2014ALLMR(Cri)4484(2014)8S CC913	Cr.P.C. S.164 statement of victim girl should not be disclosed to any person till final report
State Of Maharashtra vs Sharad B. Sarda1983 (1) BomCR 578	Cr.P.C. S.167 60th or 90th day though holiday cannot be excluded
Bom. HC Abdul Wahid Vs State Of Maharashtra on 27 August 1991	Cr.P.C. S.167 After charge sheet bail under section 436 or 437 only
Asgar Yusuf Mukadam and Ors.Vs.State of Maharashtra and The Superintendent of Prison2004CriLJ4312	Cr.P.C. S.167 Allowing Home Food is in disreation of Magistrate
Kum. Shraddha Meghshyam Velhal Vs State of Maharashtra	Cr.P.C. S.167 and 4 and POCSO Act JFCM has no jurisdiction to remand take cognizance and commit under PCSO Act
State through C.B.I. Vs.Dawood Ibrahim Kaskar and othersAIR1997SC2494	Cr.P.C. S.167 and 309 If accused was not arrested till taking cognizance his remand can be granted

In Re_ Jakir Khan @ JakerMANU-WB-0253-2012	Cr.P.C. S.167 and 437 Transit Remand granted by rejecting bail
Tamizharasi and another Vs.Assistant Director, Narcotic Control Bureau1996CriLJ208	Cr.P.C. S.167 and NDPS Act
Bom HC Daji_Govind_Kamble_vs_State_Of_Maharashtra	Cr.P.C. S.167 and S.36 of NDPS Act Magistrate remanded for more than 15 days
Bom. HC B.S. Rawat, Asstt. Collector Of ... vs Leidomann Heinrich And Another on 20 November, 1990	Cr.P.C. S.167 bail in serious offences NDPS can be cancelled
CBI vs. Anupam Kulkarni	Cr.P.C. S.167
Bhupinder_Singh_&_Ors_vs_Jarnail_Singh_&_Anr_on_13_July,_2006	Cr.P.C. S.167 For S.304B of IPC 90 days SC Rajeev Chowdhary case referred
Hitendra Vishnu Thakur vs State Of Maharashtra on 12 July, 1994	Cr.P.C. S.167 for TADA offences
Mohammed Ajmal Mohammad Amir KasabVs.State of MaharashtraAIR2012SC3565	Cr.P.C. S.167 Free legal aid should be provided from the stage of remand
Khatri And Others vs State Of Bihar AIR1981SC928	Cr.P.C. S.167 Free Legal aid to be given at remand stage
G.K._Moopnar,_M.L.A._And_Others_vs_State_Of_Tamil_Nadu_on_16_March,_1990	Cr.P.C. S.167
Prasad V.Vs.State of KeralaILR2013(2)Kerala1010	Cr.P.C. S.167 in POCSO Act offence Magistrate can entertain first remand
Arnesh KumarVs.State of Bihar AIR2014SC2756.	Cr.P.C. S.167 In S.498A IPC the Magistrate authorising detention without recording reasons is liable for departmental action
Nijamuddin_Mohammad_Bashir_Khan..._vs_State_Of_Maharashtra_on_7_July,_2006	Cr.P.C. S.167 Limitation is 60 days for 10 years imprisonment
Khatri And Others vs State Of Bihar 1981 SCC (1) 627	Cr.P.C. S.167 Magistrate and Judges shall inform accused about free legal aid
Harihar Chaitanya vs State Of U.P.1990 CriLJ 2082	Cr.P.C. S.167 Magistrate can differ with the I.O.
Manubhai Ratilal Patel Tr. Ushaben Vs. State of Gujarat and ors., AIR 2013 SC 313	Cr.P.C. S.167 Magistrate has to look into facts before granting remand
Khatri And Others vs State Of Bihar 1981 SCC (1) 627	Cr.P.C. S.167 Magistrate is under obligation to inform availability of free legal aid Free Legal aid

Mr. Uday Mohanlal Acharya Vs. State of Maharashtra 2001 CriLJ 4563	Cr.P.C. S.167
State Vs. Santokh Singh AIR 43 1956 Madhya Pradesh 13	Cr.P.C. S.167 No police custody of imprisoned accused
CBI vs. Anupam Kulkarni (1992) 3 SCC 141	Cr.P.C. S.167 PCR should be within the first Fifteen days only and that period cannot be extended under any circumstances
Rajeev Chowdhary case referred Nijamuddin_Mohammad_Bashir_Khan_..._vs_State_Of_Maharashtra_on_7_July,_2006	Cr.P.C. S.167 Period is 60 days for S.395 and 366 IPC Bom
Bhupinder_Singh_&_Ors_vs_Jarnail_Singh_&_Anr_on_13_July,_2006	Cr.P.C. S.167 Period is 90 days for S.304B IPC
Devender Kumar Vs. State of Haryana 2010 CriLJ 3849	Cr.P.C. S.167 Police custody can be in the first 15 days only. Cancellation of bail set aside
Narain Vs. Superintendent, Central Jail, New Delhi AIR 1971 SC 178	Cr.P.C. S.167 Remand in absence of accused who is not produced from jail is not illegal Raj
Mr. Uday Mohanlal Acharya Vs. State of Maharashtra 2001 CriLJ 4563	Cr.P.C. S.167 Right to bail is defeated if not availed already
AIR 1986 Raj 58 (FB)	Cr.P.C. S.167 S.309 CJM has district jurisdiction No bail than Cr.P.C.
	Cr.P.C. S.167 S.309 Rajasthan FB CJM has district jurisdiction No bail than Cr.P.C
Arnesh Kumar Vs. State of Bihar AIR 2014 SC 2756	Cr.P.C. S.167 Supreme Court directions regarding arrested accused
State of WB Vs. Dinesh Dalmia AIR 2007 SC 1801	Cr.P.C. S.167 Surrender is different from production by police
State of Maharashtra and Ors. Vs. Saeed Sohail Sheikh etc. AIR 2013 SC 168	Cr.P.C. S.167 Transfer of Under prisoners to other jails is subject to Judicial order
Iqbal Kaur Kwatra vs The Director General Of Police 1996 (2) ALT 138 AP High Court	Cr.P.C. S.167 Transit Remand
Rajeev_Choudhary_vs_State_(N.C.T.)_Of_Delhi_on_4_May,_2001	Cr.P.C. S.167(2)
Central Bureau of Investigation Vs. Rathin Dandapat and Ors. 2015(9) SCALE 120	Cr.P.C. S.167(2) Absconding accused arrested after charge sheet can be remanded to PCR

Aslam Babalal DesaiVs.State of MaharashtraAIR1993SC1	Cr.P.C. S.167(2) Accused released on default ground cannot be arrested on only count of filing of charge sheet
Sajid Basir ShaikhVs.State of Maharashtra2005(3)MhLj860	Cr.P.C. S.167(2) After charge sheet Right of accused is defeated if he fails to exercise
Bashir And Others vs State Of HaryanaBashir and Ors. Vs.State of HaryanaAIR1978SC55	Cr.P.C. S.167(2) and 437 Mere filing of charge sheet not sufficient to cancel bail
B.S. Rawat, Asstt. Collector of CustomsVs.Mohmed Azan Khan and others 1990MhLJ582	Cr.P.C. S.167(2) and NDPS Act Limit of 15 days is for police custody and not for other agency custody
Directorate of EnforcementVs.Deepak Mahajan and anotherAIR1994SC1775	Cr.P.C. S.167(2) and S.4(2)_ Magistrate has jurisdiction to remand in Customs Act case
Sayed Mohd. Ahmed KazmiVs.State, GNCTD and Ors.AIR2012SC660	Cr.P.C. S.167(2) and Unlawful Activities Act S.43D Magistrate has to grant default bail after the 90 days under Unlawful Activities Act
Directorate of EnforcementVs.Deepak Mahajan and anotherAIR1994SC1775	Cr.P.C. S.167(2) applicable to accused produced by other than police
Union of India (UOI)Vs.Thamisharasi and Ors.(1995)4SCC190	Cr.P.C. S.167(2) applicable to NDPS Act
Union of India (UOI)Vs.Nirala YadavAIR2014SC3036	Cr.P.C. S.167(2) Application filed for default bail cannot be rejected due to filing of charge sheet before decision of bail application
B.S. Rawat, Asstt. Collector Of ... vs Leidomann Heinrich And Another 1991 CriLJ 552	Cr.P.C. S.167(2)
AnilkumarVs.State of Maharashtra1990CriLJ2058	Cr.P.C. S.167(2) Bail cancelled by sessions court under section 439(2) in NDPS Case
Bashir_And_Others_vs_State_Of_Haryana_on_3_October,_1977	Cr.P.C. S.167(2) Bail cannot be cancelled on mere count of filing charge sheet later on
Central Bureau of Investigation Vs Anupam J. Kulkarni AIR1992SC1768	Cr.P.C. S.167(2)
Chaganti Satyanarayana and Ors. Vs.State of Andhra PradeshAIR1986SC2130	Cr.P.C. S.167(2) Date of production before magistrate is starting point
Directorate of EnforcementVs.Deepak Mahajan and anotherAIR1994SC1775	Cr.P.C. S.167(2) Entry in diary in not a sine quo non
Nijamuddin Mohammad Bashir Khan and Anr.Vs.State of Maharashtra2006CriLJ4266	Cr.P.C. S.167(2) For S.306 IPC period for filing chargesheet against UTP is 60 days

State of Uttar PradeshVs.Lakshmi Brahman and Anr.AIR1983SC439	Cr.P.C. S.167(2) From charge sheet till committal it is inquiry
Bhulabai wdo Barkaji MatreVs.Shankar Barkaji Matre and others S.167 CRPC1999(3) Mh.L.J. 227	Cr.P.C. S.167(2) If charge sheet is not filed in time explanation of IO to be called
Sayed Mohd. Ahmed KazmiVs.State, GNCTD and Ors.AIR2012SC660	Cr.P.C. S.167(2) in Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967
Directorate of EnforcementVs.Deepak Mahajan and anotherAIR1994SC1775	Cr.P.C. S.167(2) is applicable to accused arrested under FERA Act
Jeewan Kumar Raut and Anr.Vs.Central Bureau of InvestigationAIR2009SC2763	Cr.P.C. S.167(2) is not applicable to offences under TOHO Act as it provides for complaint only
Satyajit Ballulbhai Desai and Ors.Vs.State of GujaratI(2015)CCR321(SC)	Cr.P.C. S.167(2) Magistrate has to judicially scrutinise circumstances and if satisfied order police custody
Sayed Mohd. Ahmed KazmiVs.State, GNCTD and Ors.AIR2012SC660	Cr.P.C. S.167(2) Magistrate kept application undecided till charge sheet Held accused is entitled for bail
Hussainara Khaton and Ors. Vs.Home Secretary, State of Bihar, PatnaAIR1979SC1369	Cr.P.C. S.167(2) Magistrate shall inform the accused about the right to free legal aid and to provide it
Aslam Babalal DesaiVs.State of MaharashtraAIR1993SC1	Cr.P.C. S.167(2) Merits not be considered
Sajid Basir Shaikh vs SOM2005 (3) MhLJ 860	Cr.P.C. S.167(2) Not infeasible
Umashanker_And_Ors._vs_State_Of_Madhya_Pradesh	Cr.P.C. S.167(2) Pending bail application allowed
Nijamuddin Mohammad Bashir Khan and Anr.Vs.State of Maharashtra2006CriLJ4266	Cr.P.C. S.167(2) Period is 60 days for S.306 IPC
Shakil Khan Yasin KhanVs.The State of Maharashtra MANU-MH-0047-2014	Cr.P.C. S.167(2) Period is 60 days for S.306 IPC
Rajeev Chaudharyvs.State (N.C.T.) of DelhiAIR2001SC2369	Cr.P.C. S.167(2) Period is 60 days for S.386 IPC as punishment does not exceed 10 years
Bhupinder_Singh_&_Ors_vs_Jarnail_Singh_&_Anr_on_13_July,_2006	Cr.P.C. S.167(2) Period is 90 days for S.304B IPC
Bhulabai wdo Barkaji MatreVs.Shankar Barkaji Matre and others S.167 CRPC1999(3) Mh.L.J. 227	Cr.P.C. S.167(2) Procedure to be followed by Magistrate
Rajeev Chaudhary case A Comment	Cr.P.C. S.167(2)
Directorate of EnforcementVs.Deepak Mahajan and anotherAIR1994SC1775	Cr.P.C. S.167(2) Remand under FERA Act permissible

Palanisamy @ PalaniVs.State rep. by Inspector of Police2003-1-LW(CrI)239	Cr.P.C. S.167(2) Sanction is not part of investigation Magistrate cannot refuse charge sheet
Uday Mohanlal Acharyavs.State of Maharashtra AIR 2001 SC1 910	Cr.P.C. S.167(2)
Suresh Kumar Bhikamchand JainVs.State of Maharashtra and Anr.(2013)3SCC77	Cr.P.C. S.167(2) When Charge sheet is filed and Sanction awaited Hence no bail
Nijamuddin_Mohammad_Bashir_Khan_..._vs_State_Of_Maharashtra_on_7_July,_2006	Cr.P.C. S.167(2)(a)(ii) 60 days for 10 years offence
Hussainara Khatoon and Ors.Vs.Home Secretary, State of Bihar, PatnaAIR1979SC1377	Cr.P.C. S.167(5) Two options
Abhinandan Jha and Ors.Vs.Dinesh MishraAIR1968SC117	Cr.P.C. S.169 and 173 Magistrate cannot direct police to file charge sheet
Rameshbhai Jagjivan Vora Authorised Signatory of Gaekwad Vs.State of Gujarat and Ors.2010GLH(2)588	Cr.P.C. S.169 application before magistrate is not tenable GUJARAT HIGH COURT
Abhinandan Jha and Ors.Vs.Dinesh MishraAIR1968SC117	Cr.P.C. S.169 Magistrate cannot direct police to file charge sheet
Mohd. Rafique Abdul Rahman Vs. State of Maharashtra 2013 Bom.C.R.(Cri) 251	Cr.P.C. S.169 Magistrate does not come in picture under this section
MarotiVs.The State of Maharashtra and Ors.2015(4)BomCR(Cri)504	Cr.P.C. S.169 Mere report without final report under S.173 is not tenable
Mohd. RafiqueVs.State of Maharashtra2013BomCR(Cri)251	Cr.P.C. S.169 report before Magistration is not tenable
MarotiVs.The State of MaharashtraDecided On_ 04.02.2015	Cr.P.C. S.169 Report is report of action taken by IO and not final report
Kedar Narayan Parida & Ors vs State Of Orissa & Anr (2009)9SCC538	Cr.P.C. S.169 Report received regarding some accused. Court can direct investigation under S.156(3)
The State of BiharVs.Chandra Bhushan Singh & Ors.AIR2001SC429	Cr.P.C. S.173 and 2(d) A plaint by sub-inspector of RPF is a complaint and not a charge sheet
StateVs.Shankar Bhaurao KhirodeAIR1959Bom437	Cr.P.C. S.173 and Rule 203 of the Bombay Police Manual, Volume III Summaries A B and C explained
Union Public Service Commission Vs.S. Papaiah and othersAIR1997SC3876	Cr.P.C. S.173 Court was not justified in accepting final report without notice to the informant
Thana SinghVs.Central Bureau of Narcotics(2013)2SCC590	Cr.P.C. S.173 Electronic charge sheet -SC directed to supply copy of charge sheet in electronic form additionally
Popular MuthiahVs.State represented by Inspector of Police2006(2)ACR2157(SC)	Cr.P.C. S.173 Options available to Magistrate

Vinay TyagiVs.Irshad Ali (2013)5SCC762	Cr.P.C. S.173 Reinvestigation and further investigation is explained in
Abhinandan Jha and Ors.Vs.Dinesh MishraAIR1968SC117	Cr.P.C. S.173 Report may be one under section 169 or 170 Magistrate cannot direct to file charge sheet
Thana SinghVs.Central Bureau of Narcotics(2013)2SCC590	Cr.P.C. S.173 SC directed to supply copy of charge sheet in electronic form additionally
Bandi KotayyaVs.State (S.H.O. Nandigama) and Ors.AIR1966AP377	Cr.P.C. S.173 When cognizance is said to be taken
Chittaranjan MirdhaVs.Dulal Ghosh and Anr.(2009)6SCC661	Cr.P.C. S.173(2)(I) Different situations before Magistrate are discussed
Jakia Nasim Ahesan & Anr. vs State Of Gujarat AIR 2012 SC 243	Cr.P.C. S.173(2)(i) Magistrate to issue Notice to the informant if not taking cognizance
Rama ChaudharyVs.State of BiharAIR2009SC2308	Cr.P.C. S.173(8) (2 Judges Bench held) Magistrates prior permission is not required for further investigation-Reinvestigation is distinct
Mithabhai Pashabhai Patel and ors. Vs. State of Gujarat (2009)6SCC332	Cr.P.C. S.173(8) Accused directed to appear for interrogation without being arrested
State through C.B.I. Vs.Dawood Ibrahim Kaskar and othersAIR1997SC2494	Cr.P.C. S.173(8) Accused subsequently arrested Magistrate has dicretion to try together or separately
Hemant Dhasmane vs.Central Bureau of Investigation and anr.AIR2001SC2721	Cr.P.C. S.173(8) can be triggered by Magistrate
Hasanbhai Valibhai QureshiVs.State of Gujarat and Ors.AIR2004SC2078	Cr.P.C. S.173(8) Permits further investigation, and even dehors any direction from the Court as such
Ram Lal NarangVs.State (Delhi Administration)AIR1979SC1791	Cr.P.C. S.173(8) Police has power to further investigate but to inform and seek formal permission of Magistrate
Sri Bhagwan Samardha Sreepada Vallabha Venkata Vishwandadha Maharaj Vs.State of Andhra Pradesh & OrsAIR1999SC2332	Cr.P.C. S.173(8) Police should inform the Magistrate and seek formal permission
Chandra BabuVsState and Ors.(2015)8SCC774	Cr.P.C. S.173(8)_ Magistrate has jurisdiction to direct further investigation
Krishna Kumar VariarVs.Share Shoppe(2010)12SCC485	Cr.P.C. S.177 178 and 181 Objection of jurisdiction to be raised before summoning Court
State of Andhra PradeshVs.Cheemalapati Ganeswara Rao and Anr.AIR1963SC1850	Cr.P.C. S.177 does not govern S.223(d) Court can try offences committed in same course of transaction in other jurisdiction
State of Maharashtra Vs.Anjanabai 1997CriLJ2309	Cr.P.C. S.177 does not govern S.223(d) Court can try offences committed in same course of transaction in other jurisdiction

Y. Abraham Ajith and Ors.Vs.Inspector of Police, Chennai and Anr.AIR2004SC4286	Cr.P.C. S.177 Illtreatment took at husbands place No part of offence at her parents place Hence complaint returned
Mahender GoyalVs.Messers Kadamba International2014CriLJ1645	Cr.P.C. S.177 to 186 Complaint returning procedure laid down by Madras High Court in
Union of India (UOI) and Anr.Vs.B.N. Ananthapadmanabhiah etc.1974-- LW(CrI)82 Three judges	Cr.P.C. S.179 Old Act A Magistrate's jurisdiction is limited to his territorial jurisdiction
Mrs. Minguelin LoboVs.Smt. Archana Sawant MANU-MH-1302-2004	Cr.P.C. S.187 If the offence took beyond jurisdiction, the Magistrate should summon accused and then transfer
Trisuns Chemical Industry Vs.Rajesh Agarwal and othersAIR1999SC3499	Cr.P.C. S.187 Power of any Magistrate of the First Class to take cognizance of the offence is not impaired by territorial restrictions
Trisuns Chemical Industry Vs. Rajesh Agarwal and others AIR1999SC3499	Cr.P.C. S.187 power to take cognizance of the offence is not impaired by territorial restrictions
Musaraf Hossain KhanVs.Bhageeratha Engg. Ltd. and Ors.AIR2006SC1288	Cr.P.C. S.188 Convenience of the Victim is important
UshabenVs.Kishorbhai Chunilal Talpada and Ors.2012ACR1859	Cr.P.C. S.189A IPC Sec.494 cognizable with S. 498A on police report cognizable
Kishore Kumar Gyanchandani vs G.D. Mehrotra And Anr. AIR 2002 SC 483	Cr.P.C. S.190 Acceptance of final report does not debar the Magistrate from taking cognizance on the basis of the materials produced in a complaint proceeding.
Uma Shankar Vs.State of Bihar and Anr.(2010)9SCC479	Cr.P.C. S.190 and 319 Magistrate can take cognizance against the accused named in FIR but omitted in the charge sheet
SWIL Ltd. vs. State of Delhi (2001)6SCC670	Cr.P.C. S.190 At the stage of taking cognizance there is no question of S.319 Messers
Gopal Das Sindhi and Ors.Vs.The State of Assam and Anr.1961CriLJ39	Cr.P.C. S.190 Cognizance taking means
SITA case Bombay (DB) State vs Mainabai AIR 1962 Bom 202	Cr.P.C. S.190 Faulty Investiation not to vitiate the trial unless there was prejudice
State vs MainabaiAIR 1962 Bom 202	Cr.P.C. S.190 Faulty Investiation not to vitiate the trial unless there was prejudice
Rakesh & anr Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh 2014 STPL(Web) 524 SC	Cr.P.C. S.190 In Sessions cases Magistrate has to see only sufficient ground for proceeding and not required to weigh evidence meticulously SC Nupur TalwarCentral Bureau of Investigation and Anr

H.S. BainsVs.State (Union Territory of Chandigarh)(1980)4SCC631	Cr.P.C. S.190 Magistrate accepted B final report but proceeded under Ss.200 and 202 and took cognizance-Upheld in
Vijay Kant Thakur and Anr.Vs.State of Bihar and Anr.2010CriLJ4190	Cr.P.C. S.190 Magistrate can differ with PSO on police report and issue process for different sections
Rajinder Prasad vs. Bashir and ors.AIR2001SC3524	Cr.P.C. S.190 Magistrate can take cognizance against other accused on subsequent date also
Chittaranjan MirdhaVs.Dulal Ghosh and Anr.(2009)6SCC661	Cr.P.C. S.190 Magistrate can take cognizance against other than charge sheeted
India_Carat_Pvt._Ltd_vs_State_Of_Karnat aka_&_Anr_on_15_February,_1989	Cr.P.C. S.190 Notice to informant is necessary if cognizance is not taken
Gopal Das Sindhi and Ors.Vs.The State of Assam and Anr.1961CriLJ39(3JJs)	Cr.P.C. S.190 Options to Magistrate
M.C. MehtaVs.Union of India (UOI) and Ors.(2007)1SCC110	Cr.P.C. S.190 Passing order of S.156(3) or Search Warrant is not taking Cognizance
H.N. Rishbud and Inder Singh Vs.The State of Delhi AIR 1955 SC 196	Cr.P.C. S.190 Taj corridor case
Rajinder Prasad vs. Bashir and ors. AIR 2001 SC 3524	Cr.P.C. S.190 Trial is not vitiated if the cognizance is valid
India Carat Pvt. Ltd.Vs.State of Karnataka and Anr.AIR1989SC885	Cr.P.C. S.190(1)(b) Magistrate can proceed against accused not charge sheeted
India Carat Pvt. Ltd.Vs.State of Karnataka and Anr.AIR1989SC885	Cr.P.C. S.190(1)(b) Magistrate can take cognizance from the material of final report even if police say no offence madeout
Rattiram and Ors.Vs.State of M.P. through Inspector of PoliceAIR2012SC1485	Cr.P.C. S.190(1)(b) Options to Magistrate He can take cognizance from material of final report even if police say no offence madeout
Ratiram and others Vs State of M.P	Cr.P.C. S.193 and SC and ST Act Trial is not vitiated on mere count that Sessions Court directly accepted the charge sheet
1999CriLJ4173	Cr.P.C. S.193 and SC ST POA Act Though case was not committed Cognizance by Session Trial was not viated
Kishun Singh and Ors.Vs.State of Bihar(1993)2SCC16	Cr.P.C. S.193 Charge-sheet to be returned to police for presenting before JMFC for committal in SC and ST POA Act Referring Officer
Daulat RamVs.State of PunjabAIR1962SC1206	Cr.P.C. S.193 On committal Sessions Court gets jurisdiction to take cognizance against new accused on same material
M. Narayandas vs State Of Karnataka And Ors.,2004 Cri.L.J. 822	Cr.P.C. S.195 and IPC s.182 it is incumbent that a complaint in writing should be made by the public servant concerned for only

KAMLAPATI TRIVEDI Vs. RESPONDENT_ STATE OF WEST BENGAL1979 AIR 777	Cr.P.C. S.195 and S.340 Court can file complaint on the basis of FIR and investigation provided 340 is followed
In Re_ Vishwanath M. Hegde AIR1951Bom289	Cr.P.C. S.195 Attracted for S.211 IPC Held SC 2_1 in
Mahesh Chand SharmaVs.State of U.P. and Ors.(2009)15SCC519	Cr.P.C. S.195 Complaint for S.500 IPC maintainable though the act falls under S.211 IPC also
Syed Muzaffaruddin Khan Mohd. vs Mohd.Abdul Qadir Mohd. Abdul	Cr.P.C. S.195 No bar to complaint of false mutation entry outside court
Syed Muzaffaruddin Khan Mohd. vs Mohd.Abdul Qadir Mohd. Abdul	Cr.P.C. S.195 no bar to S.156
M.L. SethiVs.R.P. Kapur and Anr.AIR1967SC528	Cr.P.C. S.195 Not a bar to order of S.156(3) as the bar comes after investigation Then Court can file complaint
Rama Rao and Anr.Vs.Narayan and Anr.AIR1969SC724	Cr.P.C. S.195 not bar for S.211 IPC
State of PunjabVs.Brij Lal PaltaAIR1969SC355	Cr.P.C. S.195 Registrar Co-op societies is not a Court
Ajaib Singh and Anr. vs. Joginder Singh and Anr. AIR1968SC1422	Cr.P.C. S.195
State of PunjabVs.Brij Lal PaltaAIR1969SC355	Cr.P.C. S.195 Successor-in-office a Magistrate can file a complant. Limitation under police Act for offence under police Act only
Nandkishor Laxminarayan Mundhada And Ors 2008CriLJ990	Cr.P.C. S.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
Iqbal Singh Marwah and Anr.Vs.Meenakshi Marwah and Anr.AIR2005SC2119	Cr.P.C. S.195 Will forged prior to production before court. No bar. Bom says
Abdul Rehman and Ors. vs. K.M. Anees-ul-Haq 2012CriLJ1060	Cr.P.C. S.195(1) Bars unless the complaint is by the Court
Kamlapati TrivediVs.State of West BengalAIR1979SC777	Cr.P.C. S.195(1)(b) attracted for S.211 IPC
Chartered Accountants of IndiaVs.Vimal Kumar Surana and Anr. (2011) 1 SCC(Cri) 442	Cr.P.C. S.195(1)(b) Complaint by Court required for S.211 offence on False police report
M.S. SheriffVs.The State of Madras and Ors.AIR1954SC397	Cr.P.C. S.195(1)(b)(ii) and 4 Case on police report is tenable by excluding the offences which can be taken cognizance on complaint The Institute of
Durgacharan Naik and Ors.Vs.State of OrissaAIR1966SC1775	Cr.P.C. S.195(3) Criminal proceedings should be given precedence and the civil proceedings should be stayed

State of Maharashtra Vs.Dr. B.K. Subbarao and another1993CriLJ2984 Overruled	Cr.P.C. S.195Convicted under 353 acquitted under 186 of IPC
General Officer CommandingVs.CBI and Anr.AIR2012SC1890	Cr.P.C. S.197 (Overruled) For want of sanction accused was acquitted instead of discharge
SC State of Madhya PradeshSheetla Sahai and Ors.(2009)8SCC617	Cr.P.C. S.197 and P.C. Act S.19 Sanction is required for taking cognizance and not for taking charge sheet
State of Kerala Vs.V. Padmnabhan Nair(1999)5SCC690	Cr.P.C. S.197 and P.C. Act S.19ection 197 requires sanction both for those who were or are public servants
Ram Kumar Vs. State of Haryana AIR 1987 SC 735	Cr.P.C. S.197 Criminal Breach of trust is not part of duty
State of Maharashtra Vs.Dr. B.K. Subbarao and another1993CriLJ2984 Overruled	Cr.P.C. S.197 Due to want of valid sanction order will not operate as acquittal
State of U.P.Vs.Paras Nath Singh2009CriLJ3069	Cr.P.C. S.197 For want of sanction accused was aquitted instead of discharge
State of Orissa through	Cr.P.C. S.197 Forgery etc are not part of duty and hence want of sanction is no bar
Kumar Raghvendra Singh and Ors.Vs.Ganesh Chandra Jew	Cr.P.C. S.197 is and was
Suresh Kumar Bhikamchand JainVs.Pandey Ajay Bhushan and Ors.AIR1998SC1524	Cr.P.C. S.197 Necessit of sanction can be considered after evidence when it cannot be decided without evidence
Mohd. Hadi RajaVs. State of Bihar and Anr.AIR1998SC1945	Cr.P.C. S.197 not applicable to public sector undertaking employee
Parkash Singh Badal and Anr. vs State of Punjab and Ors(2007)1SCC1	Cr.P.C. S.197 Power under S.156(3) is discretionary
Rizwan Ahmed Javed Shaikh & Orsvs.Jammal Patel and Ors.AIR2001SC2198	Cr.P.C. S.197 Real test is if the complained acts were not done should it amount to dereliction of duty then sanction is necessary
Matajog DobeyVs.H.C. BhariAIR1956SC44	Cr.P.C. S.197 Sanction is required to prosecute when the search party was obstructed and there was just a scuffle
Kerala HC Sankarankutty_Menon_And_Ors._vs_Deputy_Superintendent_Of_Police,..._on_3_January,_1961	Cr.P.C. S.197 Sanction Test
Suresh Kumar Bhikamchand JainVs.Pandey Ajay Bhushan and Ors.AIR1998SC1524	Cr.P.C. S.197 Whether the accused was discharging public servant's duty or not can be considered during the progress of the case
Kumar Raghvendra Singh and Ors.Vs.Ganesh Chandra Jew	Cr.P.C. S.197 Words used are -is and was - State of Orissa through
Ashwin Nanubhai Vyas Vs. State Of Maharashtra & Anr, AIR 1967 SC 983	Cr.P.C. S.198 and S.495 of IPC complainant died mother continued complaint
S	Cr.P.C. S.198 Cognizance of S.494 with S.498A of IPC on charge sheet permissible

tate of Orisssa Vs.Sharat Chandra Sahu and another	Cr.P.C. S.198- IPC Sec.494 cognizable with S. 498A on police report cognizable
UshabenVs.Kishorbhai Chunilal Talpada and Ors.2012ACR1859	Cr.P.C. S.199 Where police took no action inspite of information remedy lies in filing complaint
Divine Retreat CentreVs.State of Kerala and Ors.AIR2008SC1614	Cr.P.C. S.200 in N.I. Act cases Affidavits are allowed in lieu of verification
Rajesh Bhalchandra ChalkeVs.State of Maharashtra and Emco Dynatorq Pvt. Ltd.2011(1)MhLj244	Cr.P.C. S.200 Second complaint on same facts when tenable remanded to High Court
Poonam Chand Jain 2005 SCC (Cri) 190	Cr.P.C. S.201 Complaint cannot be returned after issuing summons
Devendra Kishanlal DagaliaVs.Dwarkesh Diamonds Pvt. Ltd. and Ors.AIR2014SC655	Cr.P.C. S.202 Amended Examining witnesses is a compliance of postponement
Vijay Dhanuka Etc.Vs.Najima Mamtaj Etc2014CriLJ2295	Cr.P.C. S.202 In session triable offences it is not mandatory but advisable to examine all witnesses
Shivjee SinghVs.Nagendra Tiwary and Ors.AIR2010SC2261	Cr.P.C. S.202 Inquiry mandatory when accused is from far away place
2014_STPL(Web)_218_SC	Cr.P.C. S.202 Magistrate is not a silent spectator He may put questions to elicit truth Pepsi Foods Ltd. and Anr.Vs.Special Judicial
Magistrate and Ors.AIR1998SC128	Cr.P.C. S.202 Once complaint was quashed on the ground of similar complaint being pending further complaint is not tenable
Rajeev SawhneyVs.State Bank of Mauritius Ltd. and Ors.2011(6)MhLj401	Cr.P.C. S.202 Shall does not mean mandatory Not necessary to examine all witnesses in inquiry
Shivjee SinghVs.Nagendra Tiwary and Ors.AIR2010SC2261	Cr.P.C. S.203 Magistrate has no jurisdiction to recall the process
Adalat PrasadVs.Roopal Jindal and Ors.(2004)7SCC338	Cr.P.C. S.203 Sessions Trial case dismissed by Magistrate an error within jurisdiction
Kewal Krishan Lachman DasVs.Suraj Bhan and Anr.AIR1980SC1780	Cr.P.C. S.204 (Check this ratio) On receiving police report process need not be issued
Nilesh Daulatrao Lakhani vs. State of Maharashtra2014(4)BomCR(Cri)757	Cr.P.C. S.204 Adalat Prasad case applicable to Summons and Warrant cases
Subramaniam SethuramanVs.State of Maharashtra and Anr.2004CriLJ4609	Cr.P.C. S.204 and NI Act S.138 Adalat Prasad followed in
Subramaniam SethuramanVs.State of Maharashtra and Anr. (2004)13SCC324	Cr.P.C. S.204 Challenge to jurisdiction shall be made by application before trial court
Krishna Kumar VariarVs.Share Shoppe2010CriLJ3848	Cr.P.C. S.204 Check this ratio On receiving police report process need not be issued
Nilesh Daulatrao Lakhani vs. State of Maharashtra2014(4)BomCR(Cri)757	Cr.P.C. S.204 Court can insist for process fee in non cognizable offences

1Mt. Vithi and Anr. vs Tulsiram Maroti and Crown 950CriLJ746	Cr.P.C. S.204 Detailed reasons unnecessary for issuance process
Bhushan Kumar and Anr.Vs.State (NCT of Delhi) and Anr.AIR2012SC1747	Cr.P.C. S.204 order is not interlocutory Magistrate cannot review
Bhushan Kumar and Anr.Vs.State (NCT of Delhi) and Anr.AIR2012SC1747	Cr.P.C. S.204 Summons is a process issued by court calling to appear
Bhushan Kumar and Anr.Vs.State (NCT of Delhi) and Anr.(2012)5SCC422	Cr.P.C. S.204 Taking cognizance explained
Bhushan Kumar and Anr.Vs.State (NCT of Delhi) and Anr.(2012)5SCC422	Cr.P.C. S.204 Taking cognizance means becoming aware of and to take notice of judicially
AIR1997SC3750State of BiharVs.Kadra Pahadiya and Others	Cr.P.C. S.206 Notification for Special Summons
R.R. ChariVs.State of U.P.AIR1962SC1573	Cr.P.C. S.206 Use recommended by Supreme Court
Raj Kishore PrasadVs.State of Bihar and anotherAIR1996SC1931	Cr.P.C. S.209 After committal it cannot be said that the Magistrate has jurisdiction over the case
Bhushan Kumar and Anr.Vs.State (NCT of Delhi) and Anr.(2012)5SCC422	Cr.P.C. S.209 Committal under the new Code is not an enquiry strictly speaking
	Cr.P.C. S.209 Form Committal Warrant
Chhotan Sao and Anr.Vs.State of BiharAIR2014SC907	Cr.P.C. S.209 Magistrate has a duty to secure the Vicera Report etc before the committal
Raj Kishore Prasad Vs.State of Bihar and anotherAIR1996SC1931	Cr.P.C. S.209 Magistrate has no power to summon a new accused at the stage of committal
State of Uttar PradeshVs.Lakshmi Brahman and Anr.AIR1983SC439	Cr.P.C. S.209 Supplying copies under S.207 is judicial function and without its compliance there can be no committal
Chhotan Sao and anr Vs. State of Bihar AIR 2014 SC 907	Cr.P.C. S.209 Without obtaining the forensic report committal by Magistrate is mechanical and without applying mind
Pal @ Palla Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh (2010)10SCC123	Cr.P.C. S.210 Clubbing of police case and complaint case is not permissible when the accused or the offences are not same
Delhi HC State vs Ram Kanwar 1984(1)Crimes1040	Cr.P.C. S.212(2) is an enabling provision
Ranchhodlal vs State Of Madhya Pradesh AIR 1965 SC 1248	Cr.P.C. S.212, 219 and 220 are enabling provisions for joinder of trials
C.B.I.Vs.Karimullah Osan Khan	Cr.P.C. S.216 Charge may be altered any time
Ranchhodlal vs State Of Madhya Pradesh 1965 AIR 1248	Cr.P.C. S.218 and 219 Charge IPC S.409 Consecutive sentence in separate trials upheld

Manoharlal Lohe Vs. State of Madhya Pradesh 1981 CriLJ 1563	Cr.P.C. S.218 and S.409 IPC Accused never objected joint trial and hence consenting party and hence conviction upheld
Chudaman Narayan Patil vs State Of Maharashtra on 22 September, 1967	Cr.P.C. S.218 and S.409 IPC Ranchodlal followed in
Birichh Bhuian and Ors. Vs. State of Bihar AIR 1963 SC 1120	Cr.P.C. S.218 Difference between irregularity and illegality in joinder of charges
Messers Indian Sulphacid Industries DELHI MANU-DE-2870-2011	Cr.P.C. S.219 and 220 are exception section 218 of Cr.P.C.
Ranchhodlal vs State Of Madhya Pradesh 1965 AIR 1248	Cr.P.C. S.219 Charge IPC S.409 Consecutive sentence in separate trials upheld
State vs Ram Kanwar 1984 (1) Crimes 1040 Delhi	Cr.P.C. S.219 Separate charges and trials is the normal rule
Aklak Ahmed Fakruddin Patel Vs. State of Maharashtra 2011 CriLJ 126	Cr.P.C. S.220 Clubbing of police case for S.498A and 306 and complaint case for S.302 and 304B against same accused has been upheld
Manivannan And S. Krishnamoorthy vs P.R. Adhikesavan MANU-TN-0178-2008	Cr.P.C. S.220 Complainant filed separate cases of S.420 IPC and S.138 NI Act Held separate trials were not improper
Narinderjit Singh Sahni and anr. vs. Union of India and ors AIR 2001 SC 3810	Cr.P.C. S.220 Each depositor's case is individual offence
Nova Vision Electronics Pvt. Ltd. and Anr. Vs. State and Anr. 2011 CriLJ 868	Cr.P.C. S.220 For separate cheque separate trial has been justified
Praveen vs State Of Maharashtra 2001 CriLJ 3417	Cr.P.C. S.220 Same transaction Kidnapping from Nagpur Rape in Jabalpur Either Court can try
Praveen vs State Of Maharashtra 2001 CriLJ 3417	Cr.P.C. S.220 Same transaction
Nova Vision Electronics Pvt. Ltd and anr Vs. State and anr MANU-DE-4089-2009	Cr.P.C. S.220 Separate cheques separate trials
K. Prema S. Rao Vs. Yadla Srinivasa Rao AIR 2003 SC 11	Cr.P.C. S.221 Convicted for S.306 along with S.498A though charged with S.304B and 498A
Samadhan Baburao Khakare and Ors. Vs. The State of Maharashtra and Ors. 1995 (2) MhLj 464	Cr.P.C. S.222(2) Major and the minor offences must be cognate offences having main ingredients in common.
Ramesh Singh State Of Maharashtra 1993 CriLJ 2743	Cr.P.C. S.222(2) Police Act S.124 conviction upheld though the charge was under S.413 of IPC
Lalu Prasad @ Lalu Prasad Yadav Vs. State through C.B. AIR 2003 SC 3838	Cr.P.C. S.223 On the application of accused the Magistrate may amalgamate cases. He can read one case evidence in the other
Banti @ Guddu Vs. State of Madhya Pradesh AIR 2004 SC 261	Cr.P.C. S.226 and 231 APP can choose and pick his witnesses

(Satish Mehra (1996) 9 SCC 766 Overruled)-State Of Orissa vs Debendra Nath Padhi A.I.R. 2005 SCC 369	Cr.P.C. S.226 Anticipatory bail in UP upheld by SC
Dinesh Tiwari Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh dd on_ 07.07.2014 MANU-SC-0587-2014	Cr.P.C. S.227 and 239 Material produced by accused not to be considered
Union of India (UOI)Vvs.Prafulla Kumar Samal and Anr.AIR1979SC366	Cr.P.C. S.227 Charge of an offence not mentioned in charge sheet can be framed
State Of Karnataka vs Chetan Tayal	Cr.P.C. S.227 Discharge Test
V. C. Shukla vs State Through C.B.I AIR 1980 SC AIR	Cr.P.C. S.227 Documents produced by accused cannot be considered at the time of charge
Niranjan Singh Karan Singh Vs. Jitendra Bhimraj Bijje, AIR 1990 SC 1962	Cr.P.C. S.227 Framing Charge is Interlocutory order
Satish Mehra (1996) 9 SCC 766 Overruled in State Of Orissa vs Debendra Nath Padhi A.I.R. 2005 SCC 369	Cr.P.C. S.227 Marshalling of evidence not required at the stage of Charge
Willie (William) SlaneyVs.The State of Madhya PradeshAIR1956SC116	Cr.P.C. S.227 Material of accused not to be considered
M. Joy Varghese	Cr.P.C. S.227 Omission to frame charge of s.34 IPC not fatal
Smt. Snehalata MondalVs.State of West Bengal(2008)1CALLT297(HC)	Cr.P.C. S.227 Though Trial cannot consider documents of accused High Court can consider under S.482
State of BombayVs.Mohamadh KhanAIR1960Bom150	Cr.P.C. S.229 Subsequent plea of guilty accepted
Rohtash KumarVs.State of Haryana(2013)14SCC434	Cr.P.C. S.231 Additional witness for prosecution can be allowed
Ram Deo Chauhanvs.State of Assam (2001)5SCC714	Cr.P.C. S.231 and Evi Act S.114 Prosecution is not bound to examine all listed witnesses
Narpal Singh & Others vs State Of Haryana AIR 1977 SC 1066	Cr.P.C. S.235(2) Accused upon conviction can be sent to jail until hearing on sentence
Modilal Kaluram Kachhara And Etc. vs State Of Maharashtra 1988 CriLJ __1901__	Cr.P.C. S.235(2) To hear on sentence de novo trial not necessary
(Satish Mehra (1996) 9 SCC 766 Overruled)-State Of Orissa vs Debendra Nath Padhi A.I.R. 2005 SCC 369	Cr.P.C. S.239 and 240 Transfer application Rejected Complaint Against Judge
	Cr.P.C. S.239 Discharged from S.498A and 506
Kanti Bhadra Shah and Anr. Vs.The State of West BengalAIR2000SC522	Cr.P.C. S.239 Magistrate need not write order for framing charge but has to write order for discharge
M. Joy Varghese Vs The State ANU-TN-0365-2011	Cr.P.C. S.239 Under S.482 no bar to the High Court to consider the documents produced by accused

Dattatraya Dagduji Borkute 1996 CriLJ987	Cr.P.C. S.242(2) and 254(2) and 87 If warrant is not applied for, it is Court's discretion to issue warrant to the absent witness
ILR 1970(1) Del287	Cr.P.C. S.244 Accused has right to cross examine in EBC
Sunil Mehta and Anr.Vs.State of Gujarat and Anr.2013(2)BomCR(Cri)335	Cr.P.C. S.244 Statements of S.202 are not EBC
1983 Mah.L.J.494	Cr.P.C. S.244 Witness in EBC not available for cross after charge His evidence may be considered
Cricket Association of Bengal and ors Vs. State of West Bengal and ors. AIR 1971 SC 1971	Cr.P.C. S.245(2) Complaint can be dismissed before charge
Luis De Piedade Lobo Vs.Mahadev Vishwanath Parulekar1984CriLJ513	Cr.P.C. S.245(2) Opportunity to adduce EBC should be given to the Complaint
Hansraj Harjiwan Bhate and Ors.Vs.EmperorAIR1940Nag390	Cr.P.C. S.246 Additional witnesses allowed Absence of any provision on particular matter does not mean that there is no such power in criminal court
Gurmukh Singh and Ors. vs. The State of Punjab (1972)4SCC805	Cr.P.C. S.248(2) Conviction not bad for failure to adopt procedure applicable to complaint-warrant case
Sagunabai Lahanu Shende Vs.Patru Goma Lengure and others1979MhLJ18	Cr.P.C. S.249 cannot be invoked after charge
DB In Re_ Jamnabai Meghji AIR1934Bom130	Cr.P.C. S.249 Courts practice of posting case for actual hearing and simple adjournment discussed by
Narayandas Narayandas Gulabchand Agrawal v. Rakesh Kumar Nem Kumar Porwal 1996 (2) Mh.L.J. 463	Cr.P.C. S.249 Magistrate is not empowered to restore a complaint
Dagdu Govindshet WaniVs.Punja Vedu WaniAIR1937Bom55	Cr.P.C. S.250 and 350 Old Act For these sections trial commences in warrant case even before charge
IND Synergy Ltd.Vs.Goyal MG Gases Pvt. Ltd.III(2014)BC433(Del)	Cr.P.C. S.251 Adalat Prasad case would not come in way for objection to jurisdiction
Jhantu DasVs.State of Tripura(2007)2GLR443	Cr.P.C. S.251 If the admitted facts do not amount to offence accused can not be convicted

Girraj Prasad Meena Vs.State of Rajasthan and Ors 2013 (12) SCALE 275	Cr.P.C. S.252 Plead guilty for lessor offences set aside as informant had no opportunity to apply for adding charges or accused
Shri Sandeep Indravadan Sagar Vs.State of Maharashtra and others dd on 10.01.2013	Cr.P.C. S.252 Rubber stamp used for recording plea of accused Court upheld the order
State of Maharashtra Vs.Maruti Dadu Kamble 1988MhLJ49	Cr.P.C. S.255 Magistrate should issue summons on request of the prosecution, but can refuse to adjourn if no efforts taken to serve the summons
Jethalal Girdharlal Vs.State of Gujarat(1984)2GLR964	Cr.P.C. S.255(2) and Prohibition Act S.66(1)(b) Hearing on sentence gives accused to show special reason for less than minimum punishment
Jethalal Girdharlal Vs.State of Gujarat MANU-GJ-0206-1984	Cr.P.C. S.255(2) and S.66(1)(b) Magistrate has to hear the accused on sentence
In Re_ Wasudeo Narayan Phadnis AIR1950Bom10 (DB)	Cr.P.C. S.256 (Do not follow this authority) Magistrate can restore the complaint and continue from the last stage
Narayandas Gulabchand Agrawal 1996-2-MhLj463	Cr.P.C. S.256 and 249 Bombay says Magistrate has no jurisdiction to restore a dismissed complaint
Om Gayatri and company Vs. State of Maharashtra 2006 Cr.L.J.601	Cr.P.C. S.256 Bombay No revision lies against order under section
Associated Cement Co. Ltd vs Keshvanand AIR1998SC596	Cr.P.C. S.256 Court should not insist for presence of particular person should not dismiss if evidence already recorded the
Harishchandra @ Sunil Rajaram Rasker Vs.Kantilal Virchand Vora & another 1998CriLJ3754	Cr.P.C. S.256 Magistrate cannot restore complaint
Madankumar Dharamchand Jain and Anr. Vs.State of Maharashtra and Anr. 1983(1)BomCR416	Cr.P.C. S.256 Magistrate has no power to recall the dismissal order
Maj. Genl. A.S. Gauraya and Anr. Vs.S.N. Thakur and Anr. AIR1986SC1440	Cr.P.C. S.256 Magistrate not empowered to restore dismissed complaint
S. Rama Krishna Vs.S. Rami Reddy AIR2008SC2066	Cr.P.C. S.256(1) Magistrate has to dismiss complaint unless decided to adjourn for some cause
State of Maharashtra Vs.Maruti Dadu Kamble 1988MhLJ49	Cr.P.C. S.258 After summons only Magistrate can close case
Pramatha Nath Mukherjee Vs.The State of West Bengal AIR1960SC810	Cr.P.C. S.259 After discharging from warrant case trying summons case under chapter 20 is valid
Zafar and others Vs.State of U.P. 1968AWR(H.C.)38281	Cr.P.C. S.263 and 264 of old Cr.P.C Notes of evidence when need not be retained

Girraj Prasad Meena Vs.State of Rajasthan and Ors.	Cr.P.C. S.265 Plea bargaining in haste
Guerrero Lugo Elvia Grissel Vs.The State of Maharashtra 2012 CriLJ 1136	Cr.P.C. S.265A Notification of the excluded Acts
Madras HC State_By_vs_K.N.Nehru_on_3_November,_2011-1	Cr.P.C. S.265E Court has no discretion to award sentence other than one-fourth of the punishment
Ramesh Kumar Singh vs State Of Bihar And Ors. on 17 December, 1986	Cr.P.C. S.267 Formal arrest of the accused in jail
State of Maharashtra Vs. Yadav Natthuji Kohachade 2000 CriLJ 959	Cr.P.C. S.267 Non production of prisoners
State of Maharashtra and P.C. Singh Vs. Dr. Praful B. Desai and Anr. AIR 2003 SC 2053	Cr.P.C. S.267 Procedure of Production warrant
The State of Maharashtra Vs. Bhaurao Doma Udan and Others 1996(1) MhLj 214	Cr.P.C. S.273 Evidence on commission through VC allowed in Criminal cases
Abdul Rahman Vs. Emperor 1927(29) BomLR 813	Cr.P.C. S.277 Marathi deposition will prevail over English
Mir Mohd. Omar and Ors. vs. State of West Bengal AIR 1989 SC 1785	Cr.P.C. S.278 Not reding over deposition but making available for his reading was sufficient
Trial not vitiated Shivnarayan Kabra Vs. The State of Madras AIR 1967 SC 986	Cr.P.C. S.278 Object is to ensure accuracy of evidence and to give witness concerned opportunity to point out mistakes
The State Of Maharashtra vs Manik Mohan Gaikwad on 26 November, 2008	Cr.P.C. S.279 Evidence's language unknown to accused, but known to advocates.
Rajesh Kumar and Anr. Vs. State Govt. of NCT of Delhi (2008) 4 SCC 493	Cr.P.C. S.291A Test Identification Parade and purpose No provision in Cr.P.C. which obliges investigation agency to hold identification parade
Kodadi Srinivasa Lingam and Ors. Vs. State of A.P. 2001 CriLJ 602 A.P	Cr.P.C. S.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
Guwahati Sub-Divisional Market Committee Vs. Suresh Sikaria 2013(4) GLT 486	Cr.P.C. S.294 Admitted documents can be read in evidence
Himachal Pradesh Administration Vs. Om Prakash AIR 1972 SC 975	Cr.P.C. S.294 application by accused shall be considered only statement of S.313
State of Punjab vs. Naib Din AIR 2001 SC 3955	Cr.P.C. S.294 Proof without examining the expert
Constitution Bench Dharam Pal and Ors. Vs. State of Haryana and Anr. MANU-SC-0720-2013	Cr.P.C. S.296 What is formal evidence which can be taken on affidavit is explained
Jayendra Vishnu Thakur Vs. State of Maharashtra and Anr. (2009) 7 SCC 104	Cr.P.C. S.299 and 193 After committal Sessions Judge has jurisdiction to summon accused named in column no.2

Jayendra Vishnu Thakur vs. State of Maharashtra and Anr. (2009)7SCC104(1	Cr.P.C. S.299 is applicable when the accused intentionally makes inaccessible and not merely when it is shown that it is not possible to trace him
Nirmal Singh Vs.State of HaryanaAIR2000SC1416	Cr.P.C. S.299 On surrender of accused attachment to be vacated)
Smt. Urmila SahuVs.State of Orissa1998CriLJ1372 Orissa	Cr.P.C. S.299 second part is exception to S.33 of Evidence Act
Central Bureau of InvestigationVs.Abu Salem Ansari and Anr.(2011)4SCC426	Cr.P.C. S.299 Unless common evidence is recorded the evidence against the tried accused cannot be read against absconding accused
Monica BediVs.State of A.P.(2011)1SCC284	Cr.P.C. S.299(1) will be applicable if any of its conditions are satisfied
Thomas DanaVs.The State of PunjabAIR1959SC375	Cr.P.C. S.300 Double jeopardy To operate as a bar the second prosecution and the consequential punishment thereunder, must be for 'the same offence
Sangeetaben Mahendrabhai PatelVs.State of Gujarat and Anr.AIR2012SC2844	Cr.P.C. S.300 Double Jeopardy's 3 requisites
State of Karnataka through CBI Vs.C. NagarajaswamyAIR2005SC4308	Cr.P.C. S.300 No Double Jeopardy in Dishonor of Cheque case even if there was a case under S.420 IPC
Baban DaudVs.EmperorAIR1915Bom254	Cr.P.C. S.300 P.C. Act S.19 Fresh trial not barred when the Court had no jurisdiction to take cognizance due to invalid sanction
Mohammed Ajmal Mohammad Amir KasabVs.State of MaharashtraAIR2012SC3565	Cr.P.C. S.301 Trial on Sunday without legal aid was set aside
Sitaram SaoVs.State of JharkhandAIR2008SC391	Cr.P.C. S.302 Free legal aid should be provided from the stage of remand
Sitaram SaoVs.State of JharkhandAIR2008SC391	Cr.P.C. S.306 A prover relied
Narayan Chetanram ChaudharyVs.State of MaharashtraAIR2000SC3352	Cr.P.C. S.306 A prover was relied
Narayan Chetanram Chaudhary and Anr. Vs. State of Maharashtra AIR 2000 SC 3352	Cr.P.C. S.306 Pardon is not right A applicable without committal 307 applicable after committal.doc
Narayan Chetanram ChaudharyVs.State of MaharashtraAIR2000SC3352	Cr.P.C. S.306(1) is invocable at precommitment S.307 is invocable at post-commitment while state
Santosh Kumar Satishbhushan Bariyar Vs. State of Maharashtra (2009)6SCC498	Cr.P.C. S.306(1) Pardon is not right A applicable without committal 307 applicable after committal.doc
State of Himachal PradeshVs.Surinder Mohan And OthersAIR2000SC1862	Cr.P.C. S.306(1) Pardon Procedure

A. Deivendran Vs.State of T.N.AIR1998SC2821	Cr.P.C. S.306(4) Accused has no right of cross examination of the approver
Asokan L.S.Vs.State of Kerala2005CriLJ3848	Cr.P.C. S.306(4)(a) Examination of approver is mandatory if pardon tendered before committal but not mandatory if tendered by sessions court after committal
The State of MaharashtraVs.Shanti Prasad Jain1978MhLJ227	Cr.P.C. S.306(4)(a) Statement of approver is not admissible under S.33 Evi Act
Narayan Chetanram Chaudhary & Anr.Vs.State of MaharashtraAIR2000SC3352	Cr.P.C. S.306(5) CJM and ACJM and CMM and ACMM have equal jurisdiction
Mrinal Das and Ors.Vs.The State of TripuraAIR2011SC3753	Cr.P.C. S.307 After committal the approver need not be examined twice
Narayan Chetanram Chaudhary and Anr.Vs.State of MaharashtraAIR2000SC3352	Cr.P.C. S.307 is applicable after committal
Jasbir Singhvs. Vipin Kumar Jaggi and Ors.AIR2001SC2734	Cr.P.C. S.307 is invocable at post-commitment while S.306 is invocable at precommitment state
P. Ramachandra RaoVs.State of KarnatakaAIR2002SC1856	Cr.P.C. S.307 pardon is by Court NDPS Act S.64 is by executive Later overrides
Thana SinghVs.Central Bureau of Narcotics2013CriLJ1262 circulated in Pune	Cr.P.C. S.309 Common Cause and Rajdeo Sharma Cases are overruled
Vinod Kumar Vs. State of Punjab dd in 2012	Cr.P.C. S.309 Criminal Trials Directions for day to day trials
Abdul Rehman Antulay etc. etc.Vs.R.S. Nayak and another etc. etc.AIR1992SC1701	Cr.P.C. S.309 Directions given not to grant adjournments casually
N.G. Dastanevs.Shrikant S. Shivde and Anr.AIR2001SC2028	Cr.P.C. S.309 It is neither permissible nor possible nor desirable to lay down an outer limit of time
Bipin Shantilal PanchalVs.State of Gujarat and Anr.AIR2001SC1158	Cr.P.C. S.309 Magistrate new spared from adverse remarks for allowing Advocates misconduct in seeking adjournment
Abdul Rehman Antulay etc. etc.Vs.R.S. Nayak and another etc. etc.AIR1992SC1701	Cr.P.C. S.309 Mark the objected document tentatively as an exhibit
Ram Deo Chauhan @ Raj Nath vs State of Assam AIR2001SC2231	Cr.P.C. S.309 Neither permissible nor possible nor desirable to lay down an outer limit of time
Hussainara Khatoon and Ors.Vs.Home Secretary, State of Bihar, PatnaAIR1979SC1360	Cr.P.C. S.309 On conviction accused to be taken into custody pending punishment
P. Ramachandra Rao Vs State of Karnataka AIR2002SC1856	Cr.P.C. S.309 Speedy trial is of the essence of criminal justice

P. Ramachandra Rao Vs State of Karnataka AIR2002SC1856	Cr.P.C. S.309 Supreme Court cannot fix time for conclusion of trials
Mohd. Khalid Vs. State of West Bengal (2002)7SCC334	Cr.P.C. S.309 Time cannot be fixed by Supreme Court for conclusion of trials
State of U.P. vs. Shambhu Nath Singh & Ors. AIR2001SC1403	Cr.P.C. S.309 Unnecessary adjournments give a scope for a grievance that accused persons get a time to get over the witnesses
Sasi Thomas Vs. State and Ors. (2006)12SCC421	Cr.P.C. S.309 When witnesses are present and accused causes adjournment Court can remand accused or direct payment of expenses present
In Re_ Kesava Pillai and Anr. AIR1929Mad837	Cr.P.C. S.311 Court can order further investigation
Nageshwar Shri Krishna Ghobe Vs. State of Maharashtra AIR1973SC165	Cr.P.C. S.311 Just decision does not necessarily mean a decision in favour of defence
Fatehsinh Mohansinh Chauhan, Vs. Union Territory of Dadra and Nagar Haveli 2003BomCR(Cri)1103	Cr.P.C. S.311 Parties cannot control the Court's discretion to have any additional evidence
Rajendra Prasad Vs. The Narcotic Cell AIR1999SC2292	Cr.P.C. S.311 Recall of witness allowed
Iddar and Ors. Vs. Aabida and Anr. AIR2007SC3029	Cr.P.C. S.311 The power of the Court was plenary to summon or even recall any witness at any stage of the case
Rajendra Prasad vs The Narcotic Cell Through Its AIR 1999 SC 2292	Cr.P.C. S.311 to be invoked Essential for just decision
Fatehsinh Mohansinh Chauhan, Vs. Union Territory Of Dadra And Nagar, 2004 CriLJ 150	Cr.P.C. S.311 What is Lacuna. No party in a trial can be foreclosed from correcting errors
Laxman alias Laxmayya Vs. The State of Maharashtra 2012 Cri.L.J. 2826	Cr.P.C. S.311 Witness recalled to depose as they turned hostile previously due to threats by the accused
Dr. Sunil Clifford Daniel Vs. State of Punjab 2012 CriLJ4657 Prosecution	Cr.P.C. S.313 Accused be informed that he can decline to give answers and his inculpatory statements may be taken into consideration
Basavaraj R. Patil and Others Vs. State of Karnataka and Others AIR2000SC3214	Cr.P.C. S.313 AND PC Act Failure of accused to offer appropriate explanation or giving false answer may be counted as providing a missing link
State of Maharashtra Vs. Maruti Dadu Kamble 1988MhLJ49	Cr.P.C. S.313 Counsel cannot be examined
Jethalal Girdharlal Vs. State of Gujarat (1984)2GLR964	Cr.P.C. S.313 Statement is not evidence Satyavir Singh Rathi Vs. State thr. C.B.I. AIR2011SC1748

In Re_ Kannammal alias Maunammal 92Ind. Cas.695	Cr.P.C. S.313(1)(b) Accused should be warned
Basavaraj R. Patil and Others Vs.State of Karnataka and Others AIR2000SC3214(3JJs)	Cr.P.C. S.313(1)(b) Advocate cannot be examined but questionire for accused can be given
Basavaraj R. Patil and Others Vs.State of Karnataka and Others AIR2000SC3214	Cr.P.C. S.313(1)(b) Counsel cannot be examined
Satyavir Singh Rathi Vs.State thr. C.B.I. AIR2011SC1748	Cr.P.C. S.313(1)(b) Statement is not evidence
Messers Bhaskar Industries Ltd. Vs Messers Bhiwani Denim and Apparels Ltd. AIR2001SC3625	Cr.P.C. S.317 Personal exemption when can be granted
Hardeep Singh etc. Vs.State of Punjab and Ors. etc. etc. 2014(1)SCALE241	Cr.P.C. S.319 A person discharged can be arraigned again as accused after an inquiry as contemplated by Section 300(5) and 398 (5JJs)
Bholu Ram Vs.State of Punjab and Anr. 2008 Cri.L.J. 4576 SC	Cr.P.C. S.319 Accused can apply to Magistrate
Rakesh and Anr.vs.State of Haryana AIR2001SC2521	Cr.P.C. S.319 Accused named in FIR but excluded police can be summoned even without cross exam of the witness
Hardeep Singh etc. etc. Vs.State of Punjab and Ors. etc. etc. 2014(1)SCALE241	Cr.P.C. S.319
Hardeep Singh etc. Vs.State of Punjab and Ors. AIR2014SC1400	Cr.P.C. S.319 Larger Bench explained A person discharged can be arraigned again as accused after an inquiry as contemplated by Section 300(5) and 398 (5JJs)
Hardeep Singh etc. etc. Vs.State of Punjab and Ors. etc. etc. AIR2014SC1400	Cr.P.C. S.319 Larger Bench explained when can section 319 be resorted
Dr. S.S. Khanna Vs Chief Secretary, Patna and Anr. AIR1983SC595(2Judges)	Cr.P.C. S.319 Magistrate can proceed against an accused whom the Magistrate refused to summon
Uma Shankar Vs.State of Bihar and Anr. (2010)9SCC479	Cr.P.C. S.319 Magistrate can take cognizance against the accused named in FIR but omitted in the charge sheet
Kishori Singh and Ors. Vs.State of Bihar and Anr. AIR2000SC3725	Cr.P.C. S.319 Magistrate cannot issue process to FIR named but chargesheet unnamed accused at committal stage (Two Judges in)
Rajendra Singh Vs. State of U.P. and Anr AIR2007SC2786	Cr.P.C. S.319 Purpose of this power is explained
2012 STPL(Web) 521 SC	Cr.P.C. S.320 and 482 FIR quashing When can the HC on compromise
Bom FB Abasaheb Yadav Honmane Vs.The State of Maharashtra 2008 2 MhLj856	Cr.P.C. S.320 At any stage permissible

Hirabhai Jhaverbhai vs State Of Gujarat & Ors	Cr.P.C. S.320 IPC S.324 offence before amendment is compoundable
Rajesh Rajesh Kannan vs A.K. Murthy and Ors.2009-2-UC879	Cr.P.C. S.320 Non-compoundable case unfit for conciliation SC said
Rajesh Rajesh Kannan vs A.K. Murthy and Ors.2009-2-UC879	Cr.P.C. S.320 Non-compoundable case unfit for mediation SC said
Hirabhai Jhaverbhai Vs.State of Gujarat and Ors.AIR2010SC2321	Cr.P.C. S.320 Offence of S.324 IPC prior to amendment is compoundable
Rameshchandra J. Thakkar Vs.Assandas Parmanand Jhaveri, State of MaharashtraAIR1973SC84	Cr.P.C. S.320 Partly compounding is not permissible
Rajinder Singh Vs.State (Delhi Administration)AIR1980SC1200	Cr.P.C. S.320 Partly compounding was maintained without discussion on validity
Gian Singh Vs.State of Punjab and Anr.(2010)15SCC118	Cr.P.C. S.320 Referring to Larger Bench as S.420 IPC is compoundable and S.120B is non compoundable
Abasaheb Yadav Honmane Vs.The State of Maharashtra2008 2 MhLj856	Cr.P.C. S.320 Under S.482 non-compoundable offence's FIR can be quashed Bom FB
Gian Singh Vs.State of Punjab and Anr.(2012)10SCC303	Cr.P.C. S.320 When can the F.I.R. be quashed guidelines given in
Sheonandan Paswan Vs.State of Bihar and Ors.AIR1987SC877	Cr.P.C. S.321 Grounds for seeking Courts consent for withdrawal
Sheonandan Paswan Vs.State of Bihar and Ors.AIR1987SC877	Cr.P.C. S.321 Withdrawal permission principles discussed in
A.P. High Court	Cr.P.C. S.323 and 325 Magistrate shall not commit the case merely for severe punishment
Sudhir and ors. etc.vs.State of M.P. etc.AIR2001SC826	Cr.P.C. S.323 Sessions Judge has power to try any offence Cross cases should be tried by him
Khoda Bux Mal Vs.Ohadali MalAIR1949Cal308	Cr.P.C. S.325 Magistrate has to write an order but not judgment
II Addl. Judicial First Class Magistrate Vs.State of A.P.2005CriLJ1168 DB	Cr.P.C. S.325 When Magistrate cannot exceed the limit of S.29 for want of special provision he has to resort to S.325 and not 323
Rajagopal Vs.Forest Range Officer2012(1)CTC639	Cr.P.C. S.325(1) Magistrate has to record finding of guilty and CJM cannot send back case.
Rajagopal Vs.Forest Range Officer2012(1)CTC639	Cr.P.C. S.325(1) Magistrate has to record finding of guilty.
Nagesh Vs.State of Karnataka1990CriLJ2234	Cr.P.C. S.325(1) Magistrate to record finding and then refer to CJM
Jaikishan Kanjiwani Vs Kumar Matching Centre2011CriLJ134	Cr.P.C. S.326 and N.I. Act S.138 Evidence and not substance of evidence is recorded

Ramilaben Trikamlal Shah Tube and Allied Products and others	Cr.P.C. S.326 and N.I. Act S.138 Evidence on affidavit followed by cross. De novo not required
Navinchandra Hiralal Desai	Cr.P.C. S.326 and N.I. Act S.138 In summary trial only substance and not entire sentence is recorded
Mohd. Hussain @ Julfikar Ali 2012 CriLJ 4537	Cr.P.C. S.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
Ranbir Yadav Vs State of Bihar AIR 1995 SC 1219	Cr.P.C. S.326 Discretion given to court to read previous evidence
Emperor Vs. Maung Ragoon HC relies on Bombay	Cr.P.C. S.326
Pratibha Pandurang Salvi Vs. State of Maharashtra 2010CriLJ730	Cr.P.C. S.326 Once the Magistrate used the discretion to try summarily, on his transfer it should be denovo
Trial Mukesh and etc.Vs.State of Rajasthan1998CriLJ2439	Cr.P.C. S.326 Rajasthan HC in EC Act case Summary
EmperorDurgaprasad Chunnilal and Ors.AIR 1940 Nag 239	Cr.P.C. S.326 Substance of evidence can be acted upon
Tippanna Koutya Mannavaddar Bombay DB AIR1934Bom157	Cr.P.C. S.326 Summary Trials Notes Procedure
MunicipalityNagindas Maganlal AIR 1953 Bom 29	Cr.P.C. S.326 Surat Borough
J.V. Baharuni vs. State of Gujarat (2014) 10 SCC 494	Cr.P.C. S.326(3) and NI Act S.138 and 142 If the evidence was not recorded summarily but fully then no need of denovo
Nitinbhai Saevatilal Shah and Anr.Vs.Manubhai Manjibhai Panchal and Anr.AIR2011SC3076	Cr.P.C. S.326(3) and S.138 NI Act Pursis of accused would not make legal to read evidence recorded by previous Magistrate
Shyambahadur Purshottam SharmaVs.Shri. Sudhakar Narshu PoojaryMANU-MH-1393-2013	Cr.P.C. S.326(3) Denovo Trial not necessary
	Cr.P.C. S.326(3) Justice Mridula Bhatkar's judgment on summary trial
K. JayachandranVsO. Nargeese and Anr.1987CriLJ1997	Cr.P.C. S.326(3) No need of denovo trial
Abdul Sukkur Barbhuiya Vs. the State of Assam and others, Gauhati HC dd 24.01.2012 CrIRevP1922011	Cr.P.C. S.326(3) Sessions Court to record evidence denovo
Reserve Bank Employees Association, NagpurVs.State of Maharashtra and Ors.AIR1969Bom199	Cr.P.C. S.326(3) Succeeding Judge can proceed (Case under old CR.P.C.)
State of Punjab Vs.Gurmit Singh and Others AIR1 996 SC 1393	Cr.P.C. S.327 In camera proceeding directions

Sakshi Vs. Union of India and Ors. AIR 2004 SC 3566	Cr.P.C. S.327 In camera trial and not to disclose the name of the victim
The State of Maharashtra Vs. Subhashsingh Shalikram Singh Raghuwanshi 1995(1)MhLj358	Cr.P.C. S.334 Acquittal case Course to be adopted while acquitting on insanity ground
Ms. Leena Balkrishna Nair Vs. The State of Maharashtra 2010 CriLJ 3392	Cr.P.C. S.338 and IPC S.84 Accused was acquitted and released under section 338 of Cr.P.C.
State of Maharashtra Vs. Sukhdeo Singh and another AIR 1992 SC 2100	Cr.P.C. S.342 (3) Answers given by accused may be taken into consideration at enquiry or trial
D.K. Basu Vs. State of West Bengal AIR 1997 SC 610	Cr.P.C. S.342 Compensation to the victim
Arun Paswan, S.I. Vs. State of Bihar and Ors. JT 2003(10) SC 459	Cr.P.C. S.345 Contempt of Court by police officer
The Superintendent of Police Vs. The Judicial Magistrate Court, Cheyyar IV (2015) CCR 502 (Mad.)	Cr.P.C. S.349 and 91 Notice should be issued before taking action
Dayal Singh and Ors. Vs. State of Uttaranchal AIR 2012 SC 3046	Cr.P.C. S.353 Court is competent to direct departmental action against erring officers
Satya Narain Vs. State of Rajasthan 1987 WLN (UC) Raj 458	Cr.P.C. S.353 Judgment pronounced in absence of accused was upheld as he was present during the trial
A.T. Prakashan Vs. The Excise Inspector and Anr. 2014 ALL MR (Cri) 1945	Cr.P.C. S.353 Misquoting of the Section or misapplying the provisions has caused no prejudice Hence conviction maintained
State of Gujarat Vs. Kishanbhai Supreme (2014) 5 SCC 108	Cr.P.C. S.354 Acquittal case A finding needs to be recorded in each acquittal case whether the lapse was innocent or blameworthy
State of Gujarat Vs. Kishanbhai Supreme Court judgment dated 07.01.2014	Cr.P.C. S.354 Acquittal case A finding needs to be recorded in each acquittal case whether the lapse was innocent or blameworthy
Complainant Ganesh Vs. Sharanappa and anr. AIR 2014 SC 1198	Cr.P.C. S.354 and 154 The person who lodges the FIR be called the Informant and not the
Anil @ Anthony Arikswamy Joseph Vs. State of Maharashtra (2014) 4 SCC 69	Cr.P.C. S.354(3) Court has to discharge its constitutional obligations and honour legislative policy by awarding appropriate sentence, that is will of people
2012_STPL(Web)_338_SC R. MOHAN VS VIJAY KUMAR	Cr.P.C. S.357 and S.138 NI Act Compensation default sentence
R. Vijayan Vs. Baby and Anr. AIR 2012 SC 528	Cr.P.C. S.357 Compensation in S.138 N.I. Act cases
R. Vijayan Vs. Baby and Anr. AIR 2012 SC 528	Cr.P.C. S.357 Compensation in S.138 N.I. Act cases should include costs and loss
Ankush Shivaji Gaikwad Vs. State of Maharashtra AIR 2013 SC 2454	Cr.P.C. S.357 Every Courts Mandatory duty to consider compensation

Ram Pal Vs. T.S. Thakur and Adarsh Kumar Goes JT2015(2)SC496	Cr.P.C. S.357 State to compensation in S.304A IPC where accused is unable to pay
R. MohanVs.A.K. Vijaya Kumar2012CriLJ3953	Cr.P.C. S.357(3) (Simple) Imprisonment in default of compensation was justified
Dilip S. DhanukarVs.Kotak Mahindra Co. Ltd. and Anr.MANU-SC-8289-2007	Cr.P.C. S.357(3) Compensation to be less than recoverable in civil court
K.A. Abbas H.S.A.Vs.Sabu Joseph and Anr.(2010)6SCC230	Cr.P.C. S.357(3) Default sentence of compensation is legal
2012_STPL(Web)_338_SC	Cr.P.C. S.357(3) jail if compensation is unpaid explained
Sunil alias Pona Tolaram Pore (Varma) Vs. State of Maharashtra	Cr.P.C. S.360 not applicable to Maharashtra Probation not available for S.326 IPC
Chandreshwar SharmaVs.State of Bihar(2000)9SCC245	Cr.P.C. S.361 Court shall give reasons for denial of benefit of probation
Eliamma and Anr.Vs.State of Karnataka(2009)11SCC42	Cr.P.C. S.361 Mandatory to give reasons
State of PunjabVs.Prem Sagar and Ors.2008CriLJ3533	Cr.P.C. S.361 Sentence would depend on many factors
Rupam Pralhad Bhartiya Vs. State of Maharashtra and Anr.MANU-MH-1005-2011	Cr.P.C. S.361 Special Reasons to be given for not granting probation HC increased fine to one lakh
State of PunjabVs.Davinder Pal Singh Bhullar and Ors	Cr.P.C. S.362 High Court has no power under S.482 to review
Minu Kumari and Anr.Vs.The State of Bihar and Ors.AIR2006SC1937	Cr.P.C. S.362 Magistrate can drop proceeding against against whom process was issued by mistake
Mohd. Chaman Vs.State (N.C.T. of Delhi) 2001CriLJ725	Cr.P.C. S.366 propositions to be kept in mind for determination of question of death sentence
In Re_ The Additional District Judge-cum-Chief Judicial Magistrate, Nagapattinam 2003-1-LW(Cri)77	Cr.P.C. S.374 and 9 Additional Sessions Judge can hear an appeal from Assistant Sessions Judge if punishment was less than 7 years
State of MP V Bacchudas alias Balram and Ors - AIR2007SC1236	Cr.P.C. S.374 Appellate Court duties
Dilip S. DhanukarVs.Kotak Mahindra Co. Ltd. and Anr.MANU-SC-8289-2007	Cr.P.C. S.374 Right of appeal against conviction cannot be curtailed But appellate court can impose condition for suspending sentence
Messers Pioneer Castings and another Vs Employees State Insurance Corporation	Cr.P.C. S.374(2) Appeal lies to Sessions Court and not HC
Notes	Cr.P.C. S.374(2) Appeal to High Court when lies
Sudhir Niranjana Chakre Vs.Rajesh Ramdas Wankhade2014ALLMR(Cri)4624	Cr.P.C. S.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
The State of Maharashtra Vs. Hanmant Prabhakar Waidande and Ors. MANU-MH-0868-2006	Cr.P.C. S.378 Against acquittal appeal lies to sessions court in state case to high court in complaint case
State (Delhi Administration) vs. Dharampal AIR 2001 SC 2924	Cr.P.C. S.378 Limitation is 90 days for Appeal by complainant to HC against acquittal in Food Act case
Emperor Vs. Lakshman Chavji Narangikar AIR 1931 Bom 313	Cr.P.C. S.381 Assistant and Additional Sessions Judges exercise jurisdiction of Sessions Court
K.S. Panduranga Vs. State of Karnataka AIR 2013 SC 2164	Cr.P.C. S.384 to 386 Appeal once admitted - has to be decided on merits even in absence of accused
Kishori Lal Vs. Rupa and Ors. (2004) 7 SCC 638	Cr.P.C. S.389 Appellate Court shall consider nature of allegations etc for granting bail
State of Punjab Vs. Deepak Mattu AIR 2008 SC 35	Cr.P.C. S.389 High court recalled its order
Kishori Lal Vs. Rupa and Ors. (2004) 7 SCC 638	Cr.P.C. S.389(1) Appellate Court shall consider nature of allegations etc for granting bail
Mayuram Subramanian Srinivasan Vs. C.B.I. AIR 2006 SC 2449	Cr.P.C. S.389(3) is applicable only when there is right to appeal
Bondada Gajapathy Rao Vs. State of Andhra Pradesh AIR 1964 SC 1645	Cr.P.C. S.394 Old S.431 When appellant has died Appeal against fine only can be allowed to be continued but not against imprisonment
Raghu Raj Singh Rousha Vs. Shivam Sundaram Promoters ((2009) 2 SCC 363	Cr.P.C. S.397 against order refusing S.156 directing for inquiry Accused to be impleaded
Hasmukh J. Jhaveri Vs. Shella Dadlani and another 1981 Cri LJ 958	Cr.P.C. S.397 and 146 Not interlocutory
Shivaji Vithalrao Bhikane Vs. Chandrasen Jagdevrao Deshmukh 2008 Cri LJ 3761	Cr.P.C. S.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
State of Kerala Vs. K.M. Charia Abdullah and Co. AIR 1965 SC 1585	Cr.P.C. S.397 Distinction between Appeal and Revision
K. Chinnaswamy Reddy Vs. State of Andhra Pradesh AIR 1962 SC 1788	Cr.P.C. S.397 Evi Act S.27 misinterpreted by appellate Court Rehearing ordered
Madhu Limaye Vs. The State of Maharashtra AIR 1978 SC 47	Cr.P.C. S.397 Interlocutory order test explained
D. Stephens Vs. Nosibolla AIR 1951 SC 196	Cr.P.C. S.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

Madhu Limaye Vs. The State of Maharashtra AIR 1978 SC 47	Cr.P.C. S.397
Mohit alias Sonu and Anr. Vs. State of U.P. and Anr. MANU-SC-0633-2013	Cr.P.C. S.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
Raj Kapoor and Ors. Vs. State and Ors. AIR 1980 SC 258	Cr.P.C. S.397 Petition under section 482 converted to revision
Mr. Joaquim Anthony D'Souza Vs. Mrs. Milinda Rosy D'Souza	Cr.P.C. S.397 Revision against interim maintenance tenable
Yogesh Vs. The State of Maharashtra 2015(1) Bom CR (Cri) 750	Cr.P.C. S.397 Revision against order directing complainant to remain present for verification is not tenable
Kaptan Singh and others Vs. State of M.P. and another AIR 1997 SC 2485	Cr.P.C. S.397 Revision order setting aside acquittal and retrial direction upheld- I.O. findings not evidence
State of Maharashtra vs. Jagmohan Singh Kuldip Singh and Others, 2004 (7) SCC 659	Cr.P.C. S.397 Revision
K.K. Patel and Anr. Vs. State of Gujarat and Anr. AIR 2000 SC 3346	Cr.P.C. S.397 Test whether interlocutory
Madhu Limaye Vs. The State of Maharashtra AIR 1978 SC 47	Cr.P.C. S.397 What is interim order is explained
Kaptan Singh and others Vs. State of M.P. and another AIR 1997 SC 2485	Cr.P.C. S.401 Scope of revision explained
In Re_ District and Sessions Judge Raisen 2005(3) MPLJ 26	Cr.P.C. S.409(2) Sessions Judge has power to transfer parheard sessions case without hearing
Emperor Vs. Chunilal Hargovan 1926(28) BOMLR 1023	Cr.P.C. S.412 (Old) Accused who pleaded guilty can contend that his conviction was illegal
Mr. Parkar Hasan Abdul Gafoor Vs. State of Maharashtra & others 1999(5) Bom CR 481	Cr.P.C. S.413 Surety is not automatically discharged
Dhanapal Vs. State by Public Prosecutor 2009 Cri.L.J. 4647	Cr.P.C. S.417 Criminal Appellate Court When can interfere
Aher Raja Khima Vs. The State of Saurashtra AIR 1956 SC 217	Cr.P.C. S.417 It is not enough to take a different view of the evidence and there must also be substantial and compelling reasons for holding that the trial Court was wrong
Shankar Kerba Jadhav and Ors. Vs. The State of Maharashtra AIR 1971 SC 840	Cr.P.C. S.423(1) High Court set aside acquittal by sessions. It can exceed original sentence Appellate Courts Power of punishment.doc
M.R. Kudva Appellant vs State Of Andhra Pradesh 2007 (1) Crimes 50 (SC)	Cr.P.C. S.427 Concurrent plea has been rejected as offences were different

Sadashiv Chhokha Sable Sadashiv Chhokha Sable vs State Of Maharashtra1993 CriLJ 1469	Cr.P.C. S.427 Cr.P.C. Undergoing sentence means
Bapurao Trimbakrao SonawaneVs.The State of Maharashtra and The Superintendent of Police2009(111)BOMLR1271	Cr.P.C. S.427 Different cheques of same transaction with common notice can be trial at one trial
Emperor vs Waman Dinkar Kelkar 20 BOMLR 998	Cr.P.C. S.427
Rajendra B. Choudhari vs State Of Maharashtra And Anr 2007CriLJ844	Cr.P.C. S.427 Four cases of S.138 NI Act consecutive sentence justified
Gulab Gaibu Shaikh Vs The State Of Maharashtra 2001ALLMR(Cri)1404	Cr.P.C. S.427
Ranjit Singh vs Union Territory Of Chandigarh AIR 1991 SC 2296	Cr.P.C. S.427
Cr.P.C. S.427 Sentence No Policy Soman Vs State of Kerala 2012(12)SCALE719	
Cr.P.C. S.427 State Of Maharashtra vs Raju Dadaba Borge 2001 CriLJ 3638	
Cr.P.C. S.427 Sunil Anandrao Sawant Vs Government Of Maharashtra	
Ammavasai and AnrVs.Inspector of Police and Ors.AIR2000SC3544	Cr.P.C. S.427 Totality of sentence has been considered
Mohd. Akhtar Hussain alias Ibrahim Ahmed BhattiVs.Assistant Collector of Customs AIR1988SC2143	Cr.P.C. S.427 Totality of sentence has to be considered
Sadashiv Chhokha Sable Sadashiv Chhokha Sable vs State Of Maharashtra1993 CriLJ 1469	Cr.P.C. S.427 Undergoing sentence means
M.R. KudvaVs.State of Andhra PradeshAIR2007SC568	Cr.P.C. S.427 Whether concurrent or consecutive has to be considered by the latter Court convicting
Narayanan NambeesanVs.The State of Maharashtra1974(76)BOMLR690	Cr.P.C. S.428 Courts should specify the pre-conviction detention. Procedural law is retrospective gives benefit to all convicts
Shiv Mohan SinghVs.The State (Delhi Administration)AIR1977SC949	Cr.P.C. S.428 Death sentence validity upheld
Namdeo @ Ram Krushna KhotVs.The State of Maharashtra2006(6)MhLj783	Cr.P.C. S.428 Set off if not given simple misc. application is sufficient
State of Maharashtra and Anr.vs.Najakat Alia Mubarak Ali AIR2001SC2255	Cr.P.C. S.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

Maharashtra and Anr. vs. Najakat Alia Mubarak Ali AIR2001SC2255	Cr.P.C. S.428 Set off of the detention in sentenced case is available even if accused was simultaneous undergoing sentence in other case
Dinesh M.N. (S.P.)Vs.State of GujaratAIR2008SC2318	Cr.P.C. S.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
SC in Swamy Shraddananda Murali Manohar Mishra vs Vs.State Of Karnataka on 22 July, 2008	Cr.P.C. S.433 Life imprisonment with direction for rest of life
State of Haryana and Ors.Vs.Jagdish and HarpalAIR2010SC1690Remission	Cr.P.C. S.433A Case of convict was to be considered on strength of policy on existing date of his conviction
State of Haryana and Ors.Vs.Jagdish and HarpalAIR2010SC1690	Cr.P.C. S.433A For remission policy as on conviction date would prevail. If beneficial to convict policy as on date of consideration also applicable
Mulla and Anr.Vs.State of Uttar PradeshAIR2010SC942	Cr.P.C. S.433A Life imprisonment is for 20 years unless directed otherwise
Rasiklal Vs. Kisore Khanchand WadhvaniAIR2009SC1341	Cr.P.C. S.436 Bail in bailable offences is rule
Salim Ikramuddin Ansari and Anr.Vs.Officer-in-Charge, Borivali Police Station and Ors.2004(4)MhLj725	Cr.P.C. S.436 Court to call information whether the accused was released on bail or not
Sukhwant Singh & Ors. Vs. State Of Punjab (2009) 7 SCC 559	Cr.P.C. S.436 Interim Bail is inherent
Siddharam Satlingappa MhetreVs.State of Maharashtra and Ors.AIR2011SC312	Cr.P.C. S.436
Monit MalhotraVs.The State of Rajasthan1991CriLJ806	Cr.P.C. S.436 The accused in bailable offence bailed out by police need not apply to the Magistrate for fresh bail
Siddharam Satlingappa MhetreVs.State of Maharashtra and Ors.AIR2011SC312	Cr.P.C. S.436 to 450
Sandeep Jain Vs National Capital Territory of Delhi Rep. by Secretary, Home Deptt. (18.01.2000 - SC)	Cr.P.C. S.437 Accused cannot be kept in jail for failure to make payment as per bail order.
UttamkumarVs.The State of Maharashtra2012BomCR(Cri)697	Cr.P.C. S.437 and 439 Accused again arrested for added offence

Uttamkumar Vs. The State of Maharashtra 2012 Bom C.R.(Cri) 697	Cr.P.C. S.437 and 439 After bail police added life or death section Magistrate cannot release otherwise he can additional surety
Bom HC Ambarish Rangshahi Patnigere vs The State Of Maharashtra 2012(1)MhLj900	Cr.P.C. S.437 and I.P.C. S.409 JMFC has power to grant bail
Central Bureau of Investigation vs. V. Vijay Sai Reddy AIR2013SC2216	Cr.P.C. S.437 Bail cancelled accused rected to surrender
Rajesh Ranjan Yadav @ Pappu Yadav vs Cbi	Cr.P.C. S.437 Bail considerations
State of MaharashtraVs.Kaushar Yasin Qureshi and another1996(2)MhLj485	Cr.P.C. S.437 Bail for S.326 by Magistrate sustained, bail for S.302 cancelled
Sundeeep Kumar BafnaVs.State of Maharashtra and Anr.2014(4)SCALE215	Cr.P.C. S.437 Before taking the accused into judicial custody there would be arrest
Nandini BhatnagarVs.State Govt. of NCT of DelhiI(2013)DMC495	Cr.P.C. S.437 Condition not to go abroad without permission deleted
Km. Hema MishraVs.State of U.P. and Ors.AIR2014SC1066	Cr.P.C. S.437 High Court shall not direct subordinate to decide bail application on same day Interim bail is permissible,
UP FB in Amarawati and Anr. (Smt.)Vs.State of U.P.2005CriLJ755	Cr.P.C. S.437 High Court should ordinarily not direct any subordinate court to decide the bail application the same day-
Sukhwant singh vs state of punjab 2010CriLJ1435 and (2009) 7 SCC 559	Cr.P.C. S.437 Interim Bail is Inherent Power
The Balasaheb Satbhai Merchant ... vs The State Of Maharashtra 2012BomCR(Cri)841	Cr.P.C. S.437 Magistrate can grant bail in S.409 IPC as triable by himself held by Justice Potdar
EmperorVs.Rautmal Kanumal MarwadiAIR1940Bom40	Cr.P.C. S.437 Magistrate has inherent power to cancel bail which was granted by another Magistrate for the smooth trial
Batta Hanuman Vishwanath Nehare Vs. State Of Maharashtra 2001(3)MhLj465	Cr.P.C. S.437 Magistrate has no power of bail in life term cases held by Justice
Ramji Vs.State of Punjab MANU-PH-0150-2001	Cr.P.C. S.437 Magistrate has power to grant bail in offences triable by him PH HC
Mr. Ishan Vasant Deshmukh alias Prasad Vasant KulkarniVs.The State of Maharashtra2011(2)MhLj361R.C. Chavan, J	Cr.P.C. S.437 Magistrate has power to grant bail in S.409 and 467 IPC case
Allahabad HC Ram Bharoshi and Ors.Vs.State of U.P. and Anr.2004(3)ACR2563	Cr.P.C. S.437 Magistrate has power to grant bail in sessions triable offence not punishable with life or death

Prahlad Singh Bhati vs N.C.T., Delhi AIR 2001 SC 1444	Cr.P.C. S.437 Magistrate shall not grant bail in sessions triable offence Anticipatory bail for lesser offence
Jyoti Kaut Kohli Vs. State of Maha	Cr.P.C. S.437 Powers of Magistrate referred for larger bench
Dr. Raghubir Sharan Vs. The State of Bihar AIR 1964 SC 1	Cr.P.C. S.437 Second Opinion - When medical reason is a ground for bail the Magistrate can call for detailed report from medical officer
Ganeshanan Lakshmanan and Anr. Vs. The State of Maharashtra MANU-MH-0345-2009	Cr.P.C. S.437 Solvency Certificate need not be insisted for always
Dr. Raghubir Sharan Vs. The State of Bihar AIR 1964 SC 1	Cr.P.C. S.437 When medical reason is a ground for bail the Magistrate can call for detailed report from medical officer
Santosh Bhaurao Raut Vs. State of Maharashtra 1989 Mh LJ 162	Cr.P.C. S.437(1)(i) attracted even if the law prescribes death or imprisonment for life as the maximum
Bhagwat Vs. State of Maharashtra and Anr	Cr.P.C. S.437(5) Cancellation of bail for breach of condition of attending police station was set aside
Union of India and others Vs. Major General Madan Lal Yadav AIR 1996 SC 1340	Cr.P.C. S.437(6) Trial commences when the matter is posted for evidence
Cr.P.C. S.437A Allahabad HC Syed Arman Vs. State of U.P. 2012 ACR 1681	
Balkrishna Mahadev Lad Vs. State of Maharashtra 2012 Bom CR (Cri) 300	Cr.P.C. S.437A and 390 Accused even after acquittal can be detained for not furnishing surety
Sareena, O.P. Vs. State of Kerala ILR 2013(1) Kerala 537	Cr.P.C. S.437A not mandatory
2012_STPL(Web)_470_SC	Cr.P.C. S.438 An Absconding accused is not entitled for anticipatory bail
Rakesh Baban Borhade Vs. State of Maharashtra Decided On_ 19.11.2014	Cr.P.C. S.438 Anticipatory bail cannot be granted as a rule but subject to satisfaction that the accused would not misuse
Asaram Sitaram Padole Vs. Yadaora Raghobaji Hatwar and Ors. 1991(93) BOMLR 994	Cr.P.C. S.438 Anticipatory bail continues till cancellation or trial is over
Narinderjit Singh Sahni and anr. vs. Union of India and ors. (2002) 2 SCC 210	Cr.P.C. S.438 Anticipatory bail refused in while collared crimes of cheating in numerous states

State of Assam and Anr. Vs. Dr. Brojen Gogol and Ors. AIR 1997 SC 4101	Cr.P.C. S.438 Application to be heard by the High Court having jurisdiction over the place of offence with notice to that
Sumit Mehta Vs. State of N.C.T. of Delhi	Cr.P.C. S.438 Deposit condition deleted
J. Bhatkar ordjud	Cr.P.C. S.438 does not lie against non-bailable warrant by Magistrate
MP HC Dr. Pradeep Kumar Soni vs. State Of Madhya Pradesh on 13 March, 1990	Cr.P.C. S.438 High Court not to grant anticipatory bail for crime in another state
Mukesh Kishanpuria Vs. State of West Bengal 2010 (4) SCALE 649	Cr.P.C. S.438 Interim Bail -Grant of regular bail includes power to grant interim bail pending main application
Harjit Singh Vs. Union of India (UOI) and Ors. 1994 Cri LJ 3134	Cr.P.C. S.438 Jurisdiction lies with the court having local jurisdiction
Dr. Pradeep Kumar Soni Vs. State of Madhya Pradesh 1990 Cri LJ 2055	Cr.P.C. S.438 Jurisdiction lies with the court where offence took place
State of Assam and Anr. Vs. Dr. Brojen Gogol and Ors. AIR 1997 SC 4101	Cr.P.C. S.438 Jurisdiction_ Application to be heard by the High Court having jurisdiction over the place of offence with notice to that State
Narinderjit Singh Sahni and anr. vs. Union of India and ors	Cr.P.C. S.438 Not applicable to person already arrested and in prison
Shri Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia and Ors. Vs. State of Punjab AIR 1980 SC 1632	Cr.P.C. S.438 When can anticipatory bail granted is explained
Niranjan Singh and Anr. Vs. Prabhakar Rajaram Kharote and Ors. AIR 1980 SC 785	Cr.P.C. S.439 Appearance of accused before the Court amounts to custody
C.B.I. New Delhi Vs. Abhishek Verma	Cr.P.C. S.439 Bail matter
Anilkumar vs State Of Maharashtra on 15.11.1989	Cr.P.C. S.439 Cancellation of bail
Anwari Begum Vs. Sher Mohammad and Anr. AIR 2005 SC 3530	Cr.P.C. S.439 Factors to be considered for bail are discussed
Amarawati and Anr. (Smt.) Vs. State of U.P. 2005 Cri LJ 755	Cr.P.C. S.439 Interim bail can be granted on the same day UP FB in
Neeru Yadav Vs. State of U.P. 2014 (14) SCALE 59	Cr.P.C. S.439 Parity ground is not absolute Antecedents of applicant may warrant rejection of bail
Niranjan Singh & Anr vs Prabhakar Rajaram Kharote & ors 1980 AIR 785	Cr.P.C. S.439 Submitting to the Court also amounts to custody
Sundeep Kumar Bafna Vs. State of Maharashtra and Anr. MANU-SC-0239-2014	Cr.P.C. S.439 Surrender before Sessions Court and bail application
Dinesh Singh Arjun Singh Vs. State of U.P. and Pramod Singh Bhagwan Singh	Cr.P.C. S.439(1) Bail order cancelled by High court itself
Jai Krishan Vs. The State of Punjab and Others 2010 (1) RCR (Criminal) 249 Punjab	Cr.P.C. S.439(2) Bail obtained by fraud
Dinesh M_N_ (S_P_) vs State Of Gujarat on 28 April, 2008	Cr.P.C. S.439(2) Bail when to cancel

Puran, Shekhar And Anr vs Rambilas & Anr., State Of ... on 3 May, 2001	Cr.P.C. S.439(2) Cancellation of bail justified
Puran, Shekhar And Anr vs Rambilas & Anr., State Of ... on 3 May, 2001	Cr.P.C. S.439(2) Cancellation of bail
Dr_ Narendra K Amin vs State Of Gujarat And Anr on 28 April, 2008	Cr.P.C. S.439(2) When can the bail be cancelled
State (Delhi Administration)Vvs.Sanjay GandhiAIR1978SC961	Cr.P.C. S.439(2)_ Bail can be cancelled on allegation of tampering Bombay case referred in
Free Legal Aid CommitteeVs.State of BiharAIR1982SC1463	Cr.P.C. S.441(3) and 209 Bail bond is for appearance before Sessions Court also
Mr. Sajal Kumar Mitra and Ors.Vs.The State of Maharashtra2011CriLJ2744	Cr.P.C. S.445 Pending surety verification Magistrates has power to release accused on cash surety and thereafter asking him to furnish solvent sureties
Bhoja Babu Salian vs State Of Maharashtra1983 (2) BomCR 165	Cr.P.C. S.446 Forfeit first and then issue show cause notice to recover amount
Ghulam Mehdi vs State Of Rajasthan AIR1960SC1185	Cr.P.C. S.446 Show cause notice necessary
Divisional Forest Officer and Anr.Vs.G.V. Sudhakar Rao and Ors.MANU-SC-0069-1985	Cr.P.C. S.451 and 452 explained in Forest Act Case
General Insurance Council and Ors.Vs.State of Andhra Pradesh and Ors.2010CriLJ2883	Cr.P.C. S.451 and 457 Supreme Court directions regarding custody of seized properties
Delhi Excise Act State (NCT of Delhi)Vvs.Narender MANU-SC-0010-2014	Cr.P.C. S.451 Magistrate has no jurisdiction to release vehicle under
State Bank of IndiaVs.Rajendra Kumar Singh and Ors.AIR1969SC401	Cr.P.C. S.451 Party adversely affected should be heard before the Court makes an order for return of the seized property
State (NCT of Delhi)Vvs.Narender2014ALLMR(Cri)736	Cr.P.C. S.457 and Excise Act Due to confiscation clause Magistrate has no jurisdiction to release vehicle
State of KarnatakaVs.K.A. KunchindammedAIR2002SC1875	Cr.P.C. S.457 and Forest Act Magistrate has no jurisdiction to give interim custody
Navin Vasantraj Modh Vs State of Maharashtra 2012BomCR(Cri)685	Cr.P.C. S.457 Application was directed to be decided at the end
Sunderbhai Ambalal Desai And C.M. ... vs State Of Gujarat on 1 October, 2002	Cr.P.C. S.457 Directions regarding disposal of seized properties
State of U.P. and Anr.Vs.Laloo Singh(2007)7SCC334	Cr.P.C. S.457 is not applicable in view of S.50 of Wild Life Act
Sunderbhai Ambalal Desai and C.M. MudaliarVs.State of GujaratAIR2003SC638	Cr.P.C. S.457 Supreme Court guidelines for disposal of properties
Prakash Tarachand SakhreVs.Ashok Pundloikrao Wajge and Anr.2001CriLJ3024	Cr.P.C. S.457 When it is proved that T.T. forms were submitted non-transfer of registration of vehicle does not matter

Central Bureau of Investigation Vs.V.K. SehgalAIR1999SC3706	Cr.P.C. S.465(2) Court to consider whether objection had raised objection PC Act S.19
Japani SahooVs.Chandra Sekhar MohantyAIR2007SC2762	Cr.P.C. S.468 Date of filing complaint and not cognizance be counted
Limination Arun Vyas & Anr vs Anita Vyas on 14 May, 1999	Cr.P.C. S.468 Limitaion Rational and Purpose behind
Japani SahooVs.Chandra Sekhar MohantyAIR2007SC2762	Cr.P.C. S.468 Limitation Date of filing complaint and not cognizance be counted
State Of Punjab vs Sarwan Singh1981 SCALE (1)619	Cr.P.C. S.468(2) Bar of limitation on prosecutions was clearly to prevent the parties from filing cases after a long time
Jethmal Himmatmal Jain and othersVs.State of Maharashtra1981CriLJ1813	Cr.P.C. S.473 Delay should be explained in the complaint or separate application and Court should pass speaking order
Rakesh Kumar JainVs.State Through CBI AIR 2000 SC 2754	Cr.P.C. S.473 Delay stood explained
	Cr.P.C. S.473 Interest of justice cannot be interpreted to mean in the interest of prosecution
Mrs. Sarah MathewVs.The Institute of Cardio Vascular DiseasesMANU-SC-1210-2013	Cr.P.C. S.473 Notice to accused before taking cognizance is not contemplated
Kanwardeepsingh Harbansingh BediVs.The State of Maharashtra2010CriLJ315	Cr.P.C. S.475 and Court Martial (A.o.J) Rules, 1952 Notice to Commandant necessary
	Cr.P.C. S.475 Central Govt to decide Military Authority or Criminal Court Accused did not ask for counsel hence no prejudice
	Cr.P.C. S.482 and 397 Bombay HC Ramona M. Chandiramani Revision against issue process order tenable
Kailash Shreekisan ChaurasiaVs.State of Maharashtra & Ors.2012BomCR(Cri)83	Cr.P.C. S.482 Avinash Madhukar Mukhedkar vs. The State of Maharashtra NOT FOLLOWED
Modilal Kaluram Kachhara and etc.Vs.State of Maharashtra MANU-MH-0041-1988	Cr.P.C. S.482 Case transfer from one Magistrate to another Magistrate rejected
Abasaheb Yadav Honmane And ___ vs The State Of Maharashtra on 12 March, 2008	Cr.P.C. S.482 No compounding of noncompoundable offences
Harmanpreet Singh Ahluwalia & Ors_ Vs_ State Of Punjab & Ors_ on 5 May, 2009	Cr.P.C. S.482 When can FIR be quashed

Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab and Anr. 2012 Bom CR (Cri) 428	Cr.P.C. S.482 Which offences can be quashed SC in
Amrut Gajbhiye Vs. The State of Maharashtra 1974 Cri LJ 1075	Cr.P.C. S.499(1) Old Code Accused did not execute PR Bond Hence, surety not enforceable Mahadeo
Rengaswami Naicker Vs. Muruga Naicken AIR 1954 Mad 169	Cr.P.C. S.511 Old Code Judge must watch that justice triumphs
Talab Haji Hussain Vs. Madhukar Purshottam Mondkar and Anr. AIR 1958 SC 376	Cr.P.C. S.561A (Old Section) High Court can cancel bail in bailable offence
State of Gujarat Vs. Krushnmorari Ramkrushna Gupta and Ors (1988) 2 GLR 965	Cr.P.C. S. Pleading guilty After explaining charge Court should inform about minimum sentence unless special reasons are shown
The State Of Maharashtra vs 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
Sanction Matajog Dobey Vs. H.C. Bhari AIR 1956 SC 44	Cr.P.C. S.197 Constitution Bench on necessity of
Banslochan Lal and Anr. Vs. Emperor AIR 1930 Pat 195	How to deal with certain advocates
Human Rights Commission Vs. State of Gujarat and Ors. (2009) 6 SCC 342	Fair Trial and About Witnesses protection National
Nanak Chand Vs. The State of Punjab AIR 1955 SC 274	I.P.C. S.34 AND 149 Distinction is explained
Ramesh Vithal Patil Vs. State of Karnataka and Ors. 2014 (2) Crimes 227 (SC)	IPC S.304B and 498A conviction under section 306
K. Prema S. Rao and Anr. Vs. Yadla Srinivasa Rao and Ors AIR 2003 SC 11	IPC S.304B charged but convicted for S.498A and 306
State of Maharashtra Vs. Vishwanath Tukaram Umale and Ors. AIR 1979 SC 1825	IPC S.411 and Police Act S.124 and Railway Property Act S.3 Possession of property need not be necessarily a subsisting possession
Union of India (UOI) and Anr. Vs. B.N. Ananti Padmanabiah etc. AIR 1971 SC 1836	JMFC has jurisdiction throughout District
Madhav Raoji Vs. State AIR 1952 Bom 385	M.V. Act Old S.113 Conviction upheld though summons were served after 28 days
Ashok Gyanchand Vohra vs The State Of Maharashtra And Anr	MCOCA S.9 and 23 Private Complaint tenable
Kartar Singh Vs. State of Punjab (1994) 3 SCC 569	Mens rea and Law and Order and Pith and Substance
Sau Devakibai Vs State of Maharashtra Bombay HC decided on 24.07.2014	MRTP Act S.142 Prosecution not tenable for want of previous sanction
Ramesh vs State Of Rajasthan on 22 February, 2011	Murder of Money Lender Case
Mahadeo Amrut Gajbhiye Vs. The State of Maharashtra 1974 Cri LJ 1075	Old Cr.P.C. S.499(1) Accused did not execute PR Bond Hence, surety not enforceable

