



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.31354 of 2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 20.12.2022

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE G.CHANDRASEKHARAN

Crl.O.P.No.31354 of 2022

and

Crl.M.P.No.19170 of 2022

K.Mathavan

... Petitioner

Vs.

The Inspector of Police,
Thalayamangalam Police Station,
Thiruvarur District.
(Crime No.78/2017)

... Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C.,
pleaded to pass an order to call for the records connected to the Crime
No.78/2017, on the file of the respondent police Thalayamangalam and quash
the same.

For Petitioner : S.Sekar

For Respondents : Mr.S.Santhosh
Government Advocate(Crl.side)



CrI.O.P.No.31354 of 2022

WEB COPY

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed seeking to quash the First Information Report in Crime No.78 of 2017 pending on the file of the respondent Police registered for the offences under Sections 143, 186, 188, 353, 153A(1)(b) of IPC.

2. The allegation in the First Information Report is that on 24.09.2017, the petitioner along with other persons, even though permission was denied, unlawfully assembled and hoisted a flag of their community. Thereby, they had committed the aforementioned offences.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the prosecution has been launched with false allegations and even when the entire prosecution case taken at a face value, the same would not constitute any offence and continuing the prosecution is nothing but abuse of process of law. Therefore, submitted that the same may be quashed.



4. Learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) submitted that the accused unlawfully assembled even though permission was denied and thereby, First Information Report has been registered.

5. It is to be noted that while exercising the power under Section 482, 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, would not constitute any offence, in such situation, directing the parties to undergo ordeal of trial will be a futile exercise and it will infringe the right of the persons and in this regard, the Apex Court in State of Haryana and others Vs. Bhajan Lal and Others reported in 1992 Supp (1) Supreme Court Cases 335, has been 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;

(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.?’

WEB COPY

6. It is also relevant to note the definition of Unlawful Assembly:

‘Unlawful Assembly’

An assembly of five or more persons is designated an ? unlawful assembly?, if the common object of the persons composing that assembly is -

(i) to overawe by criminal force, or show of criminal force, the Central or any State Government or Parliament or the Legislature of any State, or any public servant in the exercise of the lawful power of such public servant; or

(ii) to resist the execution of any law, or of any legal process; or

(iii) to commit any mischief or criminal trespass, or other offence; or

(iv) by means of criminal force, or show of criminal force, to any person to take or obtain possession of any property, or to deprive any person of the enjoyment of a right of way, or of the use of water or other incorporeal right of which he is in possession or enjoyment, or to enforce any right or supposed right; or

(v) by means of criminal force, or show of criminal force, to compel any person to do what he is not legally bound to do, or to



CrI.O.P.No.31354 of 2022

omit to do what he is legally entitled to do.'

WEB COPY

7. Only when the assembly fit into any of the above circumstances, it could be construed as unlawful. The materials collected by the prosecution do not show that the accused had shown any criminal force to commit any mischief, crime or any offence or by way of criminal force or tried to take possession of the property or right to use of incorporeal right which is in possession of enjoyment of others or rights.

8. It is not the case of the prosecution that the accused has assembled to commit any offence. When the prosecution *prima facie* failed to establish that the assembly of five or more persons with a common object to commit any offence or any of the circumstances shown under Section 141, mere assembly of more than five persons cannot be construed that there is an unlawful assembly. Therefore, when the people gathered to hoist the flag, in the absence of any ingredients of offence under Section 141 IPC, it cannot be construed as unlawful assembly.



WEB COPY

9. Voluntary obstruction of a public servant in the discharge of his public functions is to be made out for the prosecution under Section 186 IPC. Similarly to attract the offence under Section 188, there must be disobedience to order duly promulgated by the public servant. In this case there is no evidence available to show that the accused has assembled to resist or execution of any law and there is no whisper whatsoever available 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 to a judgment of a Division Bench 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



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.31354 of 2022

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 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 he accused under Section 188 IPC stands quashed.'

10. Similarly, as far as 353 of IPC is concerned, it must be established that the accused had assaulted or indulged with criminal force to deter public servant from discharge of his duty. It is not the case of the prosecution that the accused has acted in such a manner to attract the offences under Section 353 of IPC. As far as 153A is concerned, the accused should have created disharmony or feelings of enmity, hatred or ill~will between different religious, racial, language or regional groups or castes or communities and doing acts prejudicial to maintenance of harmony. Except the FIR allegations there is no material



CrI.O.P.No.31354 of 2022

available to show that the accused has acted in a manner to attract such offences.

Further, the alleged occurrence took place in the year 2017, till now the FIR has not culminated to final report. It is to be noted that maximum punishment for the offences under Section 153A is 3 years. Other offences invite only lesser punishment. In such case, the limitation also cannot be ignored at all together. Taking cognisance is also barred by limitation. Further, police cannot proceed with the investigation for the offences under Sections 186 & 188 IPC as it is a complaint procedure. Court cannot take cognizance for the above offences in view of Section 195 Cr.P.C.

11. Considering the above, this Court is of the view that mere launching of first information report by the prosecution itself is not sufficient to reach to the conclusion that offences are made out and the materials collected by the prosecution do not support for proving the case and continuing the prosecution on shaky or without any materials is clear abuse of process of law.



CrI.O.P.No.31354 of 2022

WEB COPY12. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is allowed and the First Information Report registered in Crime No.78 of 2017 against the petitioner on the file of the respondent is quashed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

20.12.2022

Internet : Yes / No

Index : Yes / No

ham

To

1. The Inspector of Police,
Thalayamangalam Police Station,
Thiruvavarur District.
2. The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.31354 of 2022

G.CHANDRASEKHARAN,J.

ham

**Crl.O.P.No.31354 of 2022
and
Crl.M.P.No.19170 of 2022**

20.12.2022