



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 13.11.2019

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN

CrI.O.P. (MD) .No.16494 of 2019

and

CrI.M.P (MD) Nos.9782 and 9783 of 2019

1. Kaleeswara Subramaniyan @ C.Subramaniam
2. VS.Senthil Kumar
3. M.R. Ekanathan
4. C.Veluchamy
5. Guna @ Gunasekaran

..Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

- 1.The State of Tamil Nadu rep.by
The Sub Inspector of Police
Kalaiyar Kovil Police Station
Sivagangai District
(Crime No.46 /2018)

2. M.Ranjith
Sub Inspector of Police
Kalaiyarkovil Police Station
Sivagangai District

..Respondents/Complainant

PRAYER: This Criminal Original Petition has been filed under Section 482 of Criminal Procedure Code, to call for the records pursuant to the proceedings in STC No.299 of 2018 pending on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Sivagangai and quash the same.


For Petitioners :Mr.M.Karthikeyavenkita chalapathy

For Respondents : Mr.K.Suyambulinga Bharathi
No.1 Government Advocate(CrI.Side)

O R D E R

This quash petition is filed to quash the criminal proceedings in STC No.299 of 2018 pending on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Sivagangai , thereby having been taken cognizance for the offences under Sections 143 and 188 of I.P.C. as against the petitioners.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the petitioners along with others conducted agitation against the police officials without getting permission. Therefore the respondent police registered a case in crime No.46 of 2018 on the file of the first respondent, in which, the petitioners are arraigned as accused and the case was taken cognizance by the learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Sivagangai in S.T.C.No.299 of 2018. The said criminal proceedings is under challenge in this criminal original petition.



3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners have not committed any offences as alleged by the prosecution. Due to previous enmity, a false case has been foisted against the petitioners. He would further contend that the charge against the petitioners were not attracted, since there is no allegation against the petitioners. Further, he would contend that there is absolutely no witnesses have spoken about the occurrence and to connect the petitioners, there are no materials to proceed with the trial. When there is no material to proceed with the trial, the petitioners unnecessarily would not have put them an ordeal trial. Therefore, he prayed for quashment of the criminal proceedings.

4. Per contra, the learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) would submit that there are specific allegations as against the petitioners to proceed with the trial. Further, he would submit that the petitioners are habitual offender by committing this kind of crimes. Therefore, he vehemently opposed the quash petition and prayed for dismissal of the same.

5. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioners and the learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondents/State and perused the materials available on record.

6. On a perusal of the charge as against the petitioner is concerned, the first respondent levelled the charge under Sections 143 and 188 of I.P.C. as against the petitioners. It is seen from the charge that petitioners along with others conducted agitation against the police officials without getting permission. Except the official witnesses, no one has spoken about the occurrence and no one was examined to substantiate the charge against the petitioners. It is also seen from the charge itself that the charges are very simple in nature and trivial. Section 188 reads as follows:

"188. Disobedience to order duly promulgated by public servant - Whoever, knowing that, by an order promulgated by a public servant lawfully empowered to promulgate such order, he is directed to abstain from a certain act, or to take certain order with certain property in his possession or under his management, disobeys such direction, shall, if such disobedience causes or tends to cause obstruction, annoyance or injury, or risk of obstruction, annoyance or injury, to any person lawfully employed, be punished with simple imprisonment for a term which may extend to one month or with fine which may extend to two hundred rupees, or with both; and if such disobedience causes or tends to cause danger to human life, health or safety, or causes or tends to cause a riot or affray, shall be punished with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to six months, or with fine which may extend to one thousand rupees, or with both.



7. Considering the above, this Court finds that for the simple charge, the petitioners cannot be put into an ordeal trial. Therefore, this Court is inclined to quash the criminal proceedings as against the petitioners.

8. In view of the above discussions, this criminal original petition is allowed and the criminal proceedings in STC No.299 of 2018 pending on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Sivagangai, is quashed as against the petitioners herein. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (AD-I)

// True Copy //

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

aav

To

1. The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Sivagangai.

1. The Sub Inspector of Police
Kalairayar Kovil Police Station
Sivagangai District

3. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

+1 CC to Mr.M.KARTHIKEYA VENKITACHALAPTHY, Advocate (SR-97879[F]
dated 13/11/2019)

Cr1.O.P. (MD) .No.16494 of 2019
and

Cr1.M.P (MD) Nos.9782 and 9783 of 2019

13.11.2019

VB(29.11.2019) 3P 5C