



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 23659 of 2025



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 28-08-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE N. SATHISH KUMAR

CRL OP No. 23659 of 2025 & CrI.M.P.No.16139 of 2025

1. Izzas Ahamed

S/o.Haja Nazumudeen, No.27, Kathip
Lappai Street, Nagapattinam Post,
Nagapattinam District. TamilNadu -
611 001.

2. Harshad Ahamed

S/o.Shahul Hameed, No.6, Kamaliya
Street, Nagapattinam Post,
Nagapattinam District, Tamil Nadu -
611 001.

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The Sub-Inspector of Police (L and O)

E-3, Teynampet Police Station, Teynampet,
Chennai - 600 018. Cr.No.5 of 2025

2.Mohammed Irfan

Sub-Inspector of Police, E-3, Teynampet
Police Station, Teynampet, Chennai - 600
018.

Respondent(s)



PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under section 528 of BNSS to call for all the records relating to the F.I.R. in Cr.No.5 of 2025 on the file of the 1st Respondent/Complainant and quash the same and pass such further or other orders as this Honble Court.

For Petitioner(s): S.Rajesh

For Respondent: Mr.R.Vinodhraj,
Government Advocate [Crl.Side] – R1

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed to quash the First Information Report registered in Crime No.5 of 2025 on the file of the first respondent.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioners prevented the second respondent from doing his official duty and further they had threatened the defacto complainant with dire consequences. The contention of the petitioners is that they have not committed any such offence and only the defacto complainant had beaten them and abused them in filthy language. It is their



further contention that the defacto complainant had given false complaint against them as they had questioned the defacto complainant for abusing them

WEB COPY

in filthy language. Therefore, it is their contention that mere reading of the First Information Report would reveal that it is a false and frivolous in nature.

Hence, seeks to quash the First Information Report.

3. The learned Government Advocate [Criminal Side] would submit that the when the defacto complaint, who is on official duty, asked the petitioners to show the vehicle documents, they had abused and threatened him and prevented him from performing his official duty.

4. A perusal of the First Information reveals that the accused had abused and threatened the defancto complainant, who is on official duty and thereby prevented him from discharging his official duty. Hence, this Court is not inclined to quash the First Information Report.



5. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

WEB COPY

28-08-2025

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

vrc

To

1. The Sub-Inspector of Police (L and O)
E-3, Teynampet Police Station,
Teynampet, Chennai - 600 018. Cr.No.5
of 2025

2. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 23659 of 2025



N.SATHISH KUMAR J.

VRC

**CRL OP No. 23659 of
2025**

28-08-2025