



WEB COPY



CRL.O.P.No.30279 of 2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 30.11.2023

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE **G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN**

CRL.O.P.No.30279 of 2022 and
and CrI.MP.No.18552 of 2022

Arunan @ Durai Arunan

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The State Represented by
Inspector of Police,
Ariyalur Police Station,
Ariyalur District
(crime No.1175 of 2020)

2.Umasangar

... Respondents

PRAYER:

Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. praying to call for the records pertaining to the crime No.1175 of 2020 on the file of the Inspector of Police, Ariyalur Police Station, Ariyalur District and to quash the same insofar as the petitioner is concerned.

For Petitioner : Mr.K.C.Karl Marx

For Respondents

For R1 : Mr.A.Gopinath,
Government Advocate(crl.side)



WEB COPY



CRL.O.P.No.30279 of 2022

ORDER

This criminal original petition has been filed to quash the F.I.R. in crime No.1175 of 2020 registered by the first respondent police for offences under Sections 143, 269 & 271 of IPC, as against the petitioner.

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 20.10.2020, the petitioner along with other accused participated in a demonstration demanding to give assent for 7.5 reservation for the Tamil medium students in medical seats violating the restrictions imposed under Section 144 of Cr.P.C.

3. The learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is an innocent person and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. Without any base, the first respondent police registered a case in crime No.1175 of 2020 for offences under Sections 143, 269 & 271 of IPC, as against the petitioner and others. Hence he prayed to quash the same.

4. The learned Government Advocate (crl.side) appearing for the first respondent would submit that the investigation is almost completed and



the respondent police have only to file final report.

WEB COPY

5. Heard Mr.K.C.Karl Marx, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and Mr.A.Gopinath, learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the first respondent.

6. 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 the case of ***State of Haryana and others Vs. Bhajan Lal and Others*** reported in ***1992 Supp (1) Supreme Court Cases 335***, 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

7. 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 omit to do what he is legally entitled to do.-



CRL.O.P.No.30279 of 2022

WEB COPY

8. Only when the assembly fit into any of the above circumstances, it could be construed as unlawful. The accused had not 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. As such, the present FIR is liable to be quashed.

9. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition stands allowed and the FIR in crime No.1175 of 2020 registered by the first respondent police for offences under Sections 143, 269 & 271 of IPC is hereby quashed as against the petitioner alone. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

30.11.2023

Internet : Yes / No

Index : Yes / No

Speaking / Non Speaking order

lok



WEB COPY



CRL.O.P.No.30279 of 2022

To

1. Inspector of Police,
Ariyalur Police Station,
Ariyalur District
2. The Government Advocate
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



CRL.O.P.No.30279 of 2022

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN, J.

lok

Crl.O.P.No.30279 of 2022

30.11.2023