



*Crl.OP.No.27633 of 2022
and Crl.M.P.No.16993 of 2022*

WEB COPY IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 11.11.2022

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE Ms. JUSTICE **R.N.MANJULA**

Crl.O.P.No.27633 of 2022

and

Crl.M.P.No.16993 of 2022

Ashok.K

... Petitioner

Vs.

The State rep. by
The Sub Inspector of Police,
M-6 Manali Police Station,
Chennai – 600 051.

... Respondent

PRAYER: This Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C.,
to call for the records and quash the First Information Report filed by the
respondent in Crime No.756 of 2017.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Sivakumar

For Respondent : Mr.E.Raj Thilak
Additional Public Prosecutor



*Crl.OP.No.27633 of 2022
and Crl.M.P.No.16993 of 2022*

WEB COPY

ORDER

This Criminal Original petition has been filed to quash the First Information registered in Crime No.756 of 2017 pending on the file of the respondent Police as against the petitioner for the offences under Sections 143, 188 and 290 of I.P.C.

2. The allegation in the FIR indicates that on 25.04.2017, when the *defacto* complainant was on patrol duty with two other policemen, he found that 92 persons under the leadership of one Durai, who belonged to DMK party unlawfully assembled near Manali market without prior permission and raised slogan against the Central Government to waive the loan given to the farmers and to implement the demands made by the farmers and obstructed the public and traffic.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the prosecution has been launched with false allegations and even when the entire prosecution case is taken on face value, the same would not constitute any offence and



*Crl.OP.No.27633 of 2022
and Crl.M.P.No.16993 of 2022*

continuing the prosecution is nothing but abuse of process of law and hence, the FIR should be quashed.

4. The Learned Additional Public Prosecutor submitted that the accused unlawfully assembled and caused disturbance to the public and hence, the case is registered.

5. It is to be noted that while exercising the power under Section 482 of Cr.P.C, the Court should be slow. At the same time, if the Court finds that from the entire materials collected by the prosecution taken as a whole does not constitute any offence, no useful purpose will be served by allowing the parties to undergo ordeal of trial. In this regard, it is appropriate to refer the judgment of the Apex Court in ***State of Haryana and others Vs. Bhajan Lal and Others*** reported in ***1992 Supp (1) Supreme Court Cases 335***; In the said judgment, it is held as follows :

'.....

(a) where the allegations made in the First Information Report or the complaint, even if they are taken at their face value and accepted in their entirety do not prima facie constitute any offence or make out a case against the accused;



Crl.OP.No.27633 of 2022
and Crl.M.P.No.16993 of 2022

WEB COPY

(b) where the allegations in the First Information Report and other materials, if any, accompanying the F.I.R. do not disclose a cognizable offence, justifying an investigation by police officers under Section 156(1) of the Code except under an order of a Magistrate within the purview of Section 155(2) of the Code;

(c) where the uncontroverted allegations made in the FIR or 'complaint and the evidence collected in support of the same do not disclose the commission of any offence and make out a case against the accused;

(d) where the allegations in the FIR do not constitute a cognizable offence but constitute only a non-cognizable offence, no investigation is permitted by a police officer without an order of a Magistrate as contemplated under Section 155(2) of the Code;

(e) where the allegations made in the FIR or complaint are so absurd and inherently improbable on the basis of which no prudent person can ever reach a just conclusion that there is sufficient ground for proceeding against the accused;

(f) where there is an express legal bar engrafted in any of the provisions of the Code or the concerned Act (under which a criminal proceeding is instituted) to the institution and continuance of the proceedings and/or where there is a specific provision in the Code or the concerned Act, providing efficacious redress for the grievance of the aggrieved party;

(g) where a criminal proceeding is manifestly attended with mala fide and/or where the proceeding is maliciously instituted with an ulterior motive for wreaking vengeance on the accused and with a view to spite him due to private and personal grudge.'



*Crl.OP.No.27633 of 2022
and Crl.M.P.No.16993 of 2022*

WEB COPY

6. Similarly to attract the offence under Section 188 of IPC, there must be disobedience to the order duly promulgated by the public servant. In this case there is no evidence available to show that the accused has assembled to resist execution of any law. There is no whisper in the First Information Report or in the other materials to show that there were promulgation or there were any prohibitory order existed at the relevant point of time. In this regard it is relevant to refer the judgment of this Court in ***Moogambigai S.Thirugnanasammantham and others Vs. State rep. by the Inspector of Police, Karur*** reported in ***2021 0 Supreme [Mad] 555***, wherein it has been held as follows:

'....

(9) When the allegations in the FIR and the materials collected by the prosecution does not disclose the commission of any offence and make out a case against the accused and the prosecution itself is instituted with an ulterior motive for wreaking vengeance, this Court can exercise power under Section 482 Cr.P.C. with regard to quashing of the charge sheet for the offence under Section 188 IPC, this Court in Jeevanandam and others Vs. State rep. by the Inspector of Police reported in 2018-2-L.W.(Crl) 606 has relied a



*Crl.OP.No.27633 of 2022
and Crl.M.P.No.16993 of 2022*

WEB COPY *judgment in V.Gowthaman and others Vs. State rep. by its Inspector of Police, St.Thomas Mount Police Station, Chennai reported in '2018 (4) CTC 252' and held that the cognizance taken by the Magistrate under Section 188 IPC is not permissible and therefore, the prosecution of the accused under Section 188 IPC stands quashed.'*

7. Even as per the FIR, it is not the case of the defacto complainant/ Head Constable that the petitioner along with other persons have unlawfully assembled and used force or violence and hence, the offence under section 143 is not attracted. Similarly, there are no materials seen to the effect that the accused had obstructed the vehicles and public and created public nuisance. Hence, the offence under section 290 also not attracted.

8. Further, the police have no powers to initiate prosecution under section 188 of IPC. The offence under section 188 of IPC can be taken cognizance only on the complaint in writing by a public servant and Section 195 Cr.P.C mandates the same. Under these circumstances, continuing the proceedings against the petitioner is a futile exercise.



*Crl.OP.No.27633 of 2022
and Crl.M.P.No.16993 of 2022*

WEB COPY

9. Considering the above, this Court is of the view that mere launching of FIR by the prosecution itself is not sufficient to conclude that the offences are made out. The materials collected by the prosecution do not support the case and hence continuing the prosecution will not serve the ends of justice.

10. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is allowed and proceedings against the petitioner in Crime No.756 of 2017 on the file of the respondent is quashed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

11.11.2022

Index : Yes / No

Speaking / Non Speaking order

kmi

To

1.The Sub Inspector of Police,
M-6 Manali Police Station,
Chennai – 600 051.

2.The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



*Crl.OP.No.27633 of 2022
and Crl.M.P.No.16993 of 2022*

R.N.MANJULA,J.

kmi

Crl.O.P.No.27633 of 2022
and Crl.M.P.No.16993 of 2022

11.11.2022