

Crl. O.P. No. 12186 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

WEB COPY

DATED: 23.04.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN

Crl. O.P. No. 12186 of 2025

and

Crl. M.P. Nos. 8133 & 8135 of 2025

1. Easan
2. S.Thirugana Sambandham
3. S.Muthuviswanathan
4. K.Murugesan
5. P.Natarajan
6. R.Sathish Kumar
7. Dhuran Nambi @ Nalla Goundar
8. P.Vijayakumar
9. Shanmugasundaram
10. S.Kalaiselvi
11. D.Selvi
12. M.Sivasundari
13. G.Lakshmi
14. N.Sarojini

... Petitioners

Vs

1. The State represented by,
The Inspector of Police,
Palladam Police Station,
Tiruppur District.
(Crime No. 1015 of 2023)
- 2.Nanthagopal @ Nanthakumar,
Tahsildar, Palladam Taluk,
Tiruppur District.

... Respondents



Crl. O.P. No. 12186 of 2025

WEB COPY

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 to call for the records relating to in C.C. No.95 of 2023 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate, Palladam, Tiruppur District and quash the same.

For Petitioners : Mr. M. Guruprasad

For Respondents : Mr. A. Gopinath, for R1
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed to quash the proceedings in C.C. No. 95 of 2023 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate, Palladam, Tiruppur.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioners and others demanding the cancellation of the license of SG Blue Metal Quarry in Rasagoundampalayam and unlawfully assembled and occupied the office premises, refusing to vacate and obstructing official work despite repeated request. Hence, the case.



Crl. O.P. No. 12186 of 2025


WEB COPY

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.1015 of 2022 for the offences under Sections 147, 149, 353 of IPC and Section 7(1)(a) of Criminal Law Amendment Act, as against the petitioners and the same has been taken cognizance in C.C.No.95 of 2023. Hence, he prayed to quash the same.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) would submit that there are specific allegations as against the petitioners to proceed with the trial.

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 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*



WEB COPY

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:

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 -



WEB COPY

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 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



Crl. O.P. No. 12186 of 2025

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 entire proceedings in C.C.No.95 of 2023 of the file of the Judicial Magistrate, Palladam, Tiruppur District is hereby quashed as against the petitioners alone. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

23.04.2025

Index:Yes/No
Neutral Citation:Yes/No
AT

To

1. The Judicial Magistrate,
Palladam, Tiruppur District.
2. The Inspector of Police,
Palladam Police Station,
Tiruppur District.
3. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



Crl. O.P. No. 12186 of 2025

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN. J,

AT

Crl. O.P. No. 12186 of 2025 and
Crl. M.P. Nos. 8133 & 8135 of 2025

23.04.2025