



Crl.O.P. No. 14648 of 2026

WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 10.06.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M. NIRMAL KUMAR

Crl.O.P. No. 14648 of 2026

&

Crl.M.P. Nos. 9378 & 9379 of 2026

Karunakaran

..Petitioner

Vs.

1. State rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Thirukovilur Police Station,
Kallakurichi District.
(Crime No. 147 of 2024).

2. Veerasamy

..Respondents

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS to call for the records relating to the case in P.R.C. No. 03 of 2026 on the file of Judicial Magistrate Court, Thirukoilur, Kallakurichi District and quash the same.

For Petitioner

::

Mr.A. Tamilselvan



Crl.O.P. No. 14648 of 2026

WEB COPY

For Respondents :: Mr.R. Rajasekaran
Counsel for Govt. of Tamil Nadu
(Crl.Side) for R1

O R D E R

The petitioner/accused facing trial in PRC No. 03 of 2026 on the file of learned Judicial Magistrate, Thirukoilur, Kallakurichi District for the offences under Section 294(b), 506(i) IPC and Section 3(1) of Tamil Nadu Public Property (Prevention of Damage & Loss) Act, 1992, has filed this quash application.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the de facto complainant, who is an Office Assistant in Sub Court, Thirukoilur had lodged a complaint stating that on 02.04.2024 at about 5.30p.m, when the de facto complainant was on duty, the petitioner, in an inebriated condition, had entered the Integrated Court campus, used abusive words, also questioned that whether security is required for the passage of Judges and when the complainant tried to stop him, he abused him in filthy language and kicked the barricades kept for the security of the Judges by his foot. It was also alleged that the petitioner used to come to the court campus even on holidays



Crl.O.P. No. 14648 of 2026

WEB COPY

and when questioned the purpose of his visit by the court staff, he would ask them to mind their own business and also threaten them. Hence, the complaint came to be lodged and a case was registered in Crime No. 147 of 2024 . On completion of investigation, charge sheet was filed listing L.W.s 1 to 10.

3. The contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that the petitioner has been falsely implicated. There was some dispute between the petitioner and the de facto complainant. Thereafter, the de facto complainant and his colleagues had ganged up together and projected as though the petitioner was in an inebriated condition and caused obstruction and damage. In this case, the petitioner was not taken to the Doctor to prove that he was in a drunken state and no blood samples or urine samples were collected. Only to cast aspersions, the said allegations have been made. In this case, though the occurrence is said to have taken place in a public place, none of the public was examined as a witness and most of the witnesses are colleagues of the de facto complainant. Hence, the present quash petition.

4. Learned Government Counsel (Crl. Side) strongly opposed this petition and would submit that the petitioner had threatened the



Crl.O.P. No. 14648 of 2026

WEB COPY

de facto complainant, abused him and also caused damage to the barricades providing a separate passage for the Judicial Officers. L.W.s 2 and 3 are eye witnesses to the occurrence. The damaged articles were seized in the presence of L.W.s 4 and 5 under Seizure Mahazar and Observation Mahazar was prepared in the presence of L.W.s 6 and 7. The value of the damage caused was assessed and thereafter, charge sheet was filed in this case. The points raised by the petitioner are factual, which can be decided only during trial and not in a quash application.

5. Considered the submissions and perused the materials on record.

6. It is seen that the petitioner is an advocate practising in the same Court and though he claims that the de facto complainant has got animosity towards him, there is nothing to show that the said person or other court staff was inimical towards the petitioner and there is no reason shown as to why they have to make such allegations against the petitioner. Further, the petitioner primarily alleges motive, which is a matter of fact that has to be decided during trial and it will be culled out during cross-examination and the same cannot be considered in a quash application. Hence, the



Crl.O.P. No. 14648 of 2026

WEB COPY

criminal original petition is dismissed. Connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

10.06.2026

nv

To

1. The Judicial Magistrate,
Thirukoilur, Kallakurichi District.
2. The Inspector of Police,
Thirukovilur Police Station,
Kallakurichi District.
3. The Public Prosecutor, High Court,
Madras.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P. No. 14648 of 2026

M. NIRMAL KUMAR,J.

nv

Crl.O.P. No. 14648 of 2026

10.06.2026