



Crl.O.P.No.5047 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

WEB COPY

DATED : 24.02.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN

Crl.O.P.No.5047 of 2025

and

Crl.M.P.Nos.3251 & 3254 of 2025

1.Poongundran,
Vice President,
Dravidar Kazhagam.

2.Anburaj,
General Secretary,
Dravidar Kazhagam.

3.Kumaresan,
Treasurer,
Dravidar Kazhagam,
All are having party office at
No.84/1(50), E.V.K. Sampath Road,
Vepery, Chennai – 600 007.

.. Petitioners

Vs.

1.The State rep by.,
The Inspector of Police,
Egmore Police Station,
Chennai – 600 009.
(Crime No.187 of 2022)

2.M.Singaravelan,
The Sub Inspector of Police,
Egmore Police Station,
Chennai – 600 009.

.. Respondents



Crl.O.P.No.5047 of 2025

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 of B.N.S.S. /

WEB COPY

482 of Cr.P.C., praying to call for the records relating to the proceedings in C.C.No.14260 of 2022 on the file of the XIV Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore, Chennai and quash the same.

For Petitioners : Mr.D.Veerasekharan
For R1 : Mr.A.Gopinath
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed to quash the proceeding in C.C.No.14260 of 2022, pending on the file of the XIV Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore, Chennai.

2.The case of the prosecution is that on 30.04.2022 at around 16.00 hours, the Petitioners, who are members of 'Dravidar Kazhagam', unlawfully assembled near Egmore Railway Station without obtaining prior permission from the police. They allegedly carried placard against the imposition of Hindi under the leadership of Thiru.K.Veeramani, the President of Dravidar Kazhagam. Despite repeated warnings issued by the respondent police, the petitioners did not disperse. Consequently,



Cr1.O.P.No.5047 of 2025

they were arrested and the respondent police registered a *suo motu* FIR in

Crime No.187 of 2022 for offences punishable under Sections 143 and 188 of the IPC and Section 41 of TN City Police Act, 1888.

3.The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are innocent persons and they have been falsely implicated in this case. The learned counsel further submitted that the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India has held that the right to freely assemble and also right to freely express one's view are constitutionally protected fundamental rights under Part III of the Indian Constitution and their enjoyment can only be in reasonable manner and can be curtailed through a fair and non-arbitrary procedure as provided under Article 19 of the Constitution of India. He further submitted that it is the duty of the Government to protect the rights of freedom of speech and assembly that is so essential to a democracy. According to Section 195(1)(a) of Cr.P.C., no Court can take cognizance of an offence under Section 188 of IPC, except on the complaint in writing of the public servant concerned or other public servant to whom he is administratively subordinate. Further he submitted that the petitioners or any other members had never been involved in any unlawful assembly and there is no evidence that the



Crl.O.P.No.5047 of 2025

petitioners or others restrained anybody. However, the officials of the respondent police had beaten the petitioner and others. When there was lot of members involved in the protest, the respondent police had registered this case, under Sections 143 and 188 of the IPC only as against the petitioners and others. Therefore, he sought for quashing the proceeding.

4.Per contra, the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) submitted that the petitioners unlawfully assembled near Egmore Railway Station without obtaining prior permission and raised slogans and bearing placard against the imposition of Hindi. Further, he would submit that Section 188 of IPC is a cognizable offence and therefore it is the duty of the police to register a case. Though there is a bar under Section 195(a)(i) of Cr.P.C. to take cognizance for the offence under Section 188 of IPC, it does not mean that the police cannot register FIR and investigate the case. More over, the petitioners are habitual offenders in such crimes. Therefore, he vehemently opposed the quash petition and prayed for dismissal of the same.



WEB COPY

5. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) for the 1st respondent and perused the materials available on record.

6. On perusal of the charge, it is seen that the the petitioners unlawfully assembled near Egmore Railway Station without obtaining prior permission and raised slogans and bearing placard against the imposition of Hindi. Therefore, the respondent police levelled the charges under Sections 143 and 188 of IPC as against the petitioners and others. Except the official witnesses, no one has spoken about the occurrence and no one was examined to substantiate the charges against the petitioners. It is also seen from the charge itself that the charges are very simple in nature and trivial. Section 188 of IPC reads as follows:

“188. Disobedience to order duly promulgated by public servant - Whoever, knowing that, by an order promulgated by a public servant lawfully empowered to promulgate such order, he is directed to abstain from a certain act, or to take certain order with certain property in his possession or under his management, disobeys such direction, shall, if such disobedience causes or tends to cause obstruction, annoyance or injury, or risk of obstruction, annoyance or injury, to any person lawfully employed, be punished with simple



WEB COPY



Cr1.O.P.No.5047 of 2025

imprisonment for a term which may extend to one month or with fine which may extend to two hundred rupees, or with both; and if such disobedience causes or trends to cause danger to human life, health or safety, or causes or tends to cause a riot or affray, shall be punished with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to six months, or with fine which may extend to one thousand rupees, or with both.”

7.The only question for consideration is that whether the registration of case under Sections 188 and 143 of IPC, registered by the respondent is permissible under law or not? In this regard it is relevant to extract Section 195(1)(a) of the Criminal Procedure Code, 1973 :-

“195.Prosecution for contempt of lawful authority of public servants, for offences against public justice and for offences relating to documents given in evidence.

(1) No Courts shall take cognizance-

(a) (i) of any offence punishable under sections 172 to 188 (both inclusive) of the Indian Penal Code (45 of 1860), or

(ii) of any abetment of, attempt to commit, such offence, or

(iii) of any criminal conspiracy to commit, such offence, except on the complaint in writing of the public servant concerned or of some other public servant to whom he is administratively subordinate;...”

8.Therefore, it is very clear that for taking cognizance of the



WEB COPY

offences punishable under Section 188 of IPC, the public servant should lodge a complaint in writing and other than that no Court has power to take cognizance.

9.The learned counsel for the petitioners relied upon a judgement in *Mahaboob Basha Vs. Sambanda Reddiar and others* reported in *1994(1) Crimes, Page 477*. He also relied upon a judgment in a batch of quash petitions, reported in *2018-2-L.W. (Crl.) 606* in *Crl.O.P. (MD)No. 1356 of 2018*, dated *20.09.2018* in the case of *Jeevanandham and others Vs. State rep. by the Inspector of Police, Karur District*, and this Court held in Paragraph-25, as follows :-

“25.In view of the discussions, the following guidelines are issued insofar as an offence under Section 188 of IPC, is concerned:

a) A Police Officer cannot register an FIR for any of the offences falling under Section 172 to 188 of IPC.

b) A Police Officer by virtue of the powers conferred under Section 41 of Cr.P.C will have the authority to take action under Section 41 of Cr.P.C., when a cognizable offence under Section 188 IPC is committed in his presence or where such action is required, to prevent such person from committing an offence under Section 188 of IPC.



WEB COPY



Cr1.O.P.No.5047 of 2025

c) The role of the Police Officer will be confined only to the preventive action as stipulated under Section 41 of Cr.P.C and immediately thereafter, he has to inform about the same to the public servant concerned/authorised, to enable such public servant to give a complaint in writing before the jurisdictional Magistrate, who shall take cognizance of such complaint on being prima facie satisfied with the requirements of Section 188 of IPC.

d) In order to attract the provisions of Section 188 of IPC, the written complaint of the public servant concerned should reflect the following ingredients namely;

i) that there must be an order promulgated by the public servant;

ii) that such public servant is lawfully empowered to promulgate it;

iii) that the person with knowledge of such order and being directed by such order to abstain from doing certain act or to take certain order with certain property in his possession and under his management, has disobeyed; and

iv) that such disobedience causes or tends to cause;

(a) obstruction, annoyance or risk of it to any person lawfully employed; or

(b) danger to human life, health or safety; or (c) a riot or affray.

e) The promulgation issued under Section 30(2) of the



WEB COPY



Cr1.O.P.No.5047 of 2025

Police Act, 1861, must satisfy the test of reasonableness and can only be in the nature of a regulatory power and not a blanket power to trifle any democratic dissent of the citizens by the Police.

f) The promulgation through which, the order is made known must be by something done openly and in public and private information will not be a promulgation. The order must be notified or published by beat of drum or in a Gazette or published in a newspaper with a wide circulation.

g) No Judicial Magistrate should take cognizance of a Final Report when it reflects an offence under Section 172 to 188 of IPC. An FIR or a Final Report will not become void ab initio insofar as offences other than Section 172 to 188 of IPC and a Final Report can be taken cognizance by the Magistrate insofar as offences not covered under Section 195(1)(a)(i) of Cr.P.C.

h) The Director General of Police, Chennai and Inspector General of the various Zones are directed to immediately formulate a process by specifically empowering public servants dealing with for an offence under Section 188 of IPC to ensure that there is no delay in filing a written complaint by the public servants concerned under Section 195(1)(a)(i) of Cr.P.C”.



10.It is also relevant to note the definition of Unlawful

WEB COPY Assembly:

“According to Section 141 of the IPC, Unlawful Assembly means-

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

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



WEB COPY




Cr1.O.P.No.5047 of 2025

entitled to do.-

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

11.Only when the assembly fit into any of the above circumstances, it could be construed as 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.

12.In the case on hand, the First Information Report has been registered by the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 143 and 188 of IPC. He is not a competent person to register FIR for the offences punishable under Section 188 of IPC. As such, the First Information Report or final report is liable to be quashed for the offences under Section 188 of IPC. Further, the complaint does not even state as to how the protest was carried out by the petitioners and others is an unlawful protest and it does not satisfy the requirements of Section 143 and 188 of IPC. Therefore, the final report cannot be sustained and is



Crl.O.P.No.5047 of 2025

liable to be quashed.

WEB COPY

13. Accordingly, the proceeding in C.C.No.14260 of 2022 pending on the file of learned XIV Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore, Chennai, is hereby quashed and this Criminal Original Petition stands allowed. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

24.02.2025

krk

Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No
Neutral Citation : Yes / No

To

1. The XIV Metropolitan Magistrate,
Egmore, Chennai.
2. The State rep by.,
The Inspector of Police,
Egmore Police Station,
Chennai – 600 009.
3. The Sub Inspector of Police,
Egmore Police Station, Chennai – 600 009.
4. The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court, Chennai.

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN, J.



WEB COPY



Cr1.O.P.No.5047 of 2025

krk

Cr1.O.P.No.5047 of 2025

24.02.2025