



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.11801 of 2023

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

Dated: 30/06/2023

CORAM

The Hon'ble Mr.Justice **G.ILANGOVAN**

Crl.OP(MD)No.11801 of 2023

B.Vinothkumar : Petitioner/A1

Vs.

1.The Inspector of Police,
Samayanallur Police Station,
Samayanallur,
Madurai.
(Crime No.214 of 2013) : R1/Complainant

2.Samsudheen,
The Head Constable,
Samayanallur Police Station,
Madurai. : R2/De-facto Complainant

PRAYER:- Criminal Original Petition has been filed under section 482 of the Criminal Procedure Code, to call for the records relating to the First Information Report in Crime No.214 of 2013 on the file of the respondent police, Samayanallur Police Station, Madurai District and quash the same as illegal and pass such further or other orders.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Arjun

For Respondents : Mr.B.Nambiselvan
Additional Public Prosecutor



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.11801 of 2023

O R D E R

This criminal original petition has been filed seeking quashment of the FIR in Crime No.214 of 2013 on the file of the 1st respondent.

2.The case of the prosecution in brief:-

The de-facto complainant lodged a complaint stating that when he was working as Head Constable in Samayanallur Police station, on 08/08/2013 at about 10.00 pm, the accused made a phone and threatened him with dire consequences. On the basis of the above said occurrence, a case in Crime No.214 of 2013 was registered for the offences under sections 294(b), 353 and 506(i)IPC.

3.Seeking quashment of the same, this petition has been filed by the petitioner on the sole ground that none of the allegations mentioned in FIR attract any of the ingredients of the offences as alleged.

4.Heard both sides.

5.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would straightaway draw the attention of this court to the allegations made in the FIR.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.11801 of 2023

6. Section 294(b) IPC reads as follows:-

"294(b) sings, recites or utters any obscene song, ballad or words, in or near any public place, shall be punished with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to three months, or with fine, or with both."

7. Now coming to the legal ground, the statement of law on this issue has been clarified by the Hon'ble Supreme Court the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***N.S.Madhanagopal and another Vs. K.Lalitha (2022 LiveLaw (SC) 844***).. Let me extract the settlement of law for better appreciation.

".....the test of obscenity is this, whether the tendency of the matter charged as obscenity is to deprave and corrupt those whose minds are open to such immoral influences". This test has been uniformly followed in India. The Supreme Court has accepted the correctness of the test in Ranjit D.Udeshi V. State of Maharashtra, AIR 1965 SC 881. In Samuel Roth V. U.S.A., 354 US 476(1957), Chief Justice Warren said that the test of 'obscenity' is the "substantial tendency to corrupt by arousing lustful desires". Mr. Justice Harlan observed that in order to be 'obscene' the matter must 'tend to sexually impure thoughts'. I do not think



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.11801 of 2023

that the words uttered in this case have such a tendency. It may be that the words are defamatory of the complainant, but I do not think that the words are 'obscene' and the utterance would constitute an offence punishable under S.294(b) IPC."

8. So when we apply the above said statement of law, I am of the considered view that not even the obscene words alleged to have been spoken by the petitioner has been stated by the de-facto complainant. But mere allegation that the petitioner used the abusive word does not satisfy to attract the offence under section 294(b) IPC. So when we read the FIR, in the context of the Hon'ble Supreme Court decision in the case of N.S.Madhanagopal and another Vs. K.Lalitha (2002 LiveLaw (SC) 844), it is seen that the ingredients of section 294(b) IPC are not attracted.

9. With regard to the offence under section 506(i) IPC, it has been simply stated that there was criminal intimidation.

10. Section 503 IPC reads as follows:-

"503. Criminal intimidation.—

Whoever threatens another with any injury to his person, reputation or



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.11801 of 2023

property, or to the person or reputation of any one in whom that person is interested, with intent to cause alarm to that person, or to cause that person to do any act which he is not legally bound to do, or to omit to do any act which that person is legally entitled to do, as the means of avoiding the execution of such threat, commits criminal intimidation."

11.When we draw the allegation mentioned in the FIR to the ingredients, it is also seen that it is not attracted. A simple abusive word alleged to have been exaggerated as if he was criminally intimidated.

12.Further, it is not the case of the prosecution that the accused used criminal force to deter public servant from discharging his official duty to attract the offence under section 353 of IPC.

13.For the above stated reasons, this criminal original petition is allowed. The FIR in Crime No.214 of 2013 on the file of the 1st respondent is hereby quashed.

Index:Yes/No
Internet:Yes/No

30/06/2023

er



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.11801 of 2023

WEB COPY To,

- 1.The Inspector of Police,
Samayanallur Police Station,
Madurai.
- 2.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.11801 of 2023

G. ILANGO VAN, J

er

Crl.OP (MD) No.11801 of 2023

30/06/2023