



CRL.O.P.No.5528 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 27.02.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN

Crl.O.P.No.5528 of 2025 and
Crl.MP.no.3567 of 2025

1.Elavazhagan

2.Jeeva @ Amarnath

... Petitioners

Vs.

1.The State Rep.By
The Inspector of Police,
Sholinghur Police Station,
Ranipet District.
(Cr.No.286 of 2023)

2.Sekar

... Respondents

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS praying to call for the records from the first respondent police in crime No.286 of 2024 and to quash the same insofar as the petitioners concerned.

For Petitioners : Mr.R.Thirumoorthy

For Respondents

For R1 : Mr.K.M.D.Muhilan,
Government Advocate (Crl.side)

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed to quash the FIR in crime No.286 of 2024 on the file of the first respondent police registered for



CRL.O.P.No.5528 of 2025


the offences under Sections 189(2), 223 & 126(2) of BNS, 2023.

WEB COPY

2. The case of the prosecution is that without any prior permission, demanding arrest of the accused persons involved in the murder of one, Robert @ Rajkumar and raising slogans against the police, the petitioners and other persons unlawfully assembled at Arakkonam to Sholinghur Road - opposite to Paranjai Bus-stand - and caused heavy traffic by sitting on the road. Hence, the complaint.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners are innocent persons and they have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. Without any base, the first respondent police has registered the FIR in Crime No.286 of 2024 under the aforesaid offences against the petitioners and others. Hence, he prayed to quash the same.

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



5. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned


Government Advocate (Crl.side) for the first respondent police 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 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



WEB COPY

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.”



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

WEB COPY “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.-

8. Only when the assembly fit into any of the above circumstances, it



CRL.O.P.No.5528 of 2025

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.

9. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition stands allowed and the FIR in Crime No.286 of 2024 registered by the first respondent police for the offences under Sections 189(2), 223 & 126(2) of BNS, 2023 is hereby quashed as against the petitioners. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

27.02.2025
(2/2)

Internet : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Speaking / Non Speaking order
lok



WEB COPY



CRL.O.P.No.5528 of 2025

To

- 1.The Inspector of Police,
Sholinghur Police Station,
Ranipet District.
- 2.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



CRL.O.P.No.5528 of 2025

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN, J.

lok

Crl.O.P.No.5528 of 2025

27.02.2025

(2/2)