



Crl. O.P. No. 3210 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

WEB COPY

DATED: 09.04.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN

Crl. O.P. No. 3210 of 2024

and

Crl. M.P. No. 2355 of 2024

1.Arul

2.Bhagyaraj

... Petitioners

Vs

1.The State Represented by,
The Inspector of Police,
Vandavasi North Police Station,
Tiruvannamalai District.
(Crime No. 256 of 2023)

2.Govindarajalu

... Respondents

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C., to call for the entire records pertaining to the impugned First Information Report in Crime No. 256 of 2023 on the file of the first respondent and quash as against the petitioners are concerned.

For Petitioners : Mr. Henri Tiphagne

For Respondents : Mr. R. Vinothraja, for R1
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)



Crl. O.P. No. 3210 of 2024

ORDER

WEB COPY

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed to quash the FIR in Crime No.256 of 2023 dated 02.11.2023 for the offences under Sections 143, 294(b), 341, 353, 283, 290 and 109 of IPC.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioners and other persons conducted demonstration against the acquisition of agricultural land for the SIPCOT Industry project in Vandavasi to Kancheepuram Melma Junction, without any permission from the respondent police. Hence, the complaint.

3. The learned Counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners are innocent person and they have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. Without any base, the first respondent police registered a case in Crime No.256 of 2023 for the offences under Sections 143, 294(b), 341, 353, 283, 290 and 109 of IPC, as against the petitioners. Hence, he prayed to quash the same.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) would submit that the investigation is almost completed and the respondent police is about to file a final report.



WEB COPY


5. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) for the first respondent and perused materials available on record.

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 ***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



WEB COPY

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



WEB COPY

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.”

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

Section 141 of IPC defines as under: -

“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 -

first. - 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

Second. - To resist the execution of any law, or of any legal process; or

Third. - To commit any mischief or criminal trespass, or other offence; or

Fourth. - 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



Crl. O.P. No. 3210 of 2024

WEB COPY

Fifth. - 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.-

Explanation. - An assembly which was not unlawful when it assembled, may subsequently become an unlawful assembly.

8. Only when the assembly fit into any of the above circumstances, it could be construed unlawful. In this case, the accused had neither shown any criminal force to commit any mischief, crime or offence nor by way of criminal force, tried to take possession of a tangible or intangible property or a corporeal or incorporeal right which is in possession and enjoyment of others.


9. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition stands allowed and the FIR in Crime No.256 of 2023 registered by the first respondent police for the offences under Sections 143, 294(b), 341, 353, 283, 290 and 109 of IPC is hereby quashed as against the petitioners alone. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

09.04.2025

Index:Yes/No

Neutral Citation:Yes/No

AT



Crl. O.P. No. 3210 of 2024

To
WEB COPY

- 1.The Inspector of Police,
Vandavasi North Police Station,
Tiruvannamalai District.
- 2.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



Crl. O.P. No. 3210 of 2024

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN. J,

AT

Crl. O.P. No. 3210 of 2024 and
Crl. M.P. No. 2355 of 2024

09.04.2025