

## State Of Karnataka vs Muniyalla on 12 November, 1984

**Equivalent citations:** AIR1985SC470, 1985CRILJ751, 1984(2)SCALE1015, (1985)1SCC196, AIR 1985 SUPREME COURT 470, 1985 CRIAPPR(SC) 12, 1985 CURCRIJ 59, 1985 SRILJ 12, 1985 BBCJ 43, (1985) ILR (KANT) 623, ILR 1985 KANT 623, (1985) IJR 77 (SC), (1985) SC CR R 162, (1985) 1 CRILC 248, (1985) 1 ALLCRILR 425, 1985 CHANDLR(CIV&CRI) 406

**Author:** P.N. Bhagwati

**Bench:** P.N. Bhagwati, V. Khalid

### JUDGMENT

P.N. Bhagwati, J.

1. Leave granted.

2. On the basis of a complaint lodged by one Muniyamma the police registered a case being Crime No. 90 of 1979 under Sections 302 and 307 of the Indian Penal Code and on completion of the investigation, filed a charge-sheet against the respondent for the offences under Sections 302 and 307 IPC. The Chief Judicial Magistrate took cognizance of the offences and committed the case to the Court of Sessions, Bangalore. The Sessions Judge registered the case as Sessions Case No. 15/79. It appears that the jurisdiction of the Sessions Court was transferred to the Court of City and Sessions Judge Bangalore and the High Court therefore by an order dated 30th December 1980 made in exercise of the powers conferred under Section 407 of the CrPC withdrew Sessions Case No. 15/79 from the Sessions Judge, Bangalore and transferred it to the Principal City Civil and Sessions Judge, Metropolitan area, Bangalore City for disposal in accordance with law. The Principal City Civil and Sessions Judge registered the case as Sessions Case No. 17/81 and by an Order dated 30th January 1981, purporting to be in exercise of the power vested under Section 409(1) of the CrPC transferred the case to the VIth Additional City Civil and Sessions Judge, Bangalore. The VIth Additional City Civil and Sessions Judge tried Sessions Case No. 17/81 and at the end of the trial the respondent was Convicted of the offences under Section 302 and Section 307 IPC and sentenced to suffer imprisonment for life. The respondent there upon preferred an appeal to the High Court.

3. The High Court took the view that the VIth Additional City Civil and Sessions Judge, Bangalore had no jurisdiction to try Sessions Case No. 17/81, since that case had not been made over to him by the Principal City Civil and Sessions Judge, under Section 194 of the CrPC and the order of conviction and sentence passed by the VIth Additional City Civil and Sessions Judge against the respondent was therefore vitiated. The High Court accordingly set aside the conviction and sentence

recorded against the respondent and directed the Principal City Civil and Sessions Judge to see "that on receipt of the records, the trial of the said Sessions Case is held in accordance with law bearing in mind the aforementioned observations made in the Judgment." The state of Karnataka being aggrieved by this Order passed by the High Court preferred the present appeal after obtaining Special Leave from this Court.

4. Now it is obvious that the Judgment of the High Court is patently wrong and cannot be sustained and in fact Mr. Kapil Sibbal appearing on behalf of the respondent, with his usual candour and frankness, stated that it was difficult for him to support the Judgment. We may proceed on the basis that the VIth Additional City Civil and Sessions Judge could try only such Sessions Cases as were made over to him by the Principal City Civil and Sessions Judge in exercise of the powers conferred under Section 194 of the Criminal Procedure Code, though we are not at all sure that, even if the VIth Addl. City Civil & Sessions Judge tried a Sessions Case which was not formally made over to him, the trial would be invalid, because in any event the VIth Addl. City Civil & Sessions Judge would have inherent jurisdiction to try the Sessions Case. We need not however, go into that question because we find that there was an order made by the Principal City Civil & Sessions Judge on 30th January 1981 making over Sessions Case No. 17/79 to the VIth Addl. City Civil & Sessions Judge, Bangalore. Undoubtedly this order was purported to be made by the Principal City Civil and Sessions Judge in exercise of the powers conferred under Section 409 of the CrPC and this Section did not confer power on the Principal City Civil and Sessions Judge to make over Sessions Case No. 17/79 to the VIth Additional City Civil and Sessions Judge. But it is now well-settled that merely because an order is purported to be made under a wrong provision of law, it does not become invalid so long as there is some other provision of law under which the order could be validly made. Mere recital of a wrong provision of law does not have the effect of Invalidating an order which is otherwise within the power of the authority making it. Here the Principal City Civil and Sessions Judge had power under Section 194 of the CrPC to make over Sessions Case. No. 17/79 to the VIth Additional City Civil and Sessions Judge and the order made by him on 30th January 1981 was clearly within his authority and the only error was that he recited a wrong Section of the CrPC. The order dated 30th January 1981 made by the Principal City Civil and Sessions Judge must be read as an order made under Section 194 of the CrPC in so far as the direction making over Sessions Case No. 17/79 to the VIth Additional City Civil & Sessions Judge is concerned. We are therefore of the view that Sessions Case No. 17/79 was validly made over to the VIth Additional City-Civil & Sessions Judge and he had jurisdiction to try that Sessions Case. The Judgment of the High Court setting aside the conviction and sentence recorded against the respondent on the ground that the VIth Additional City Civil & Sessions Judge has no jurisdiction to try Sessions Case No. 17/79, must consequently be held to be erroneous.

5. We accordingly allow the appeal, set aside the Judgment of the High Court and direct that the appeal preferred by the respondent shall be heard by the High Court on merits and it shall be disposed of in accordance with law.

6. Since the respondent had addressed a communication to this court requesting that a lawyer may be appointed to represent him in the appeal before us, we requested Miss Kamini Jaiswal and Mr. Kapil Sibbal, Senior Advocate, to appear on behalf of the respondent and to assist the Court. We are

grateful to Miss Kamini Jaiswal and Mr. Kapil Sibbal for the assistance which they have been good enough to render to us at the hearing of the appeal.