



Crl.O.P.No.32335 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 27.11.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA

Crl.O.P.No.32335 of 2025 and
Crl.M.P.No.22446 of 2025

1. N.Baskaran
2. D.Prabakaran
3. B.Parthiban
4. A.Shanmugam
5. NGM.Joseph
6. R.Kalaiselvi
7. S.Danieal
8. R.Radhakrishnan
9. G.Jayaprakash
- 10.B.Harikrishnan
- 11.G.Sathish

... Petitioners

Vs.

1. State of Tamil Nadu rep. by
Inspector of Police
Kumaran Nagar Police Station
Chennai
(Crime No.41 of 2025)

2. Saravanan
Burial Ground Assistant
Zone -10, Division-139
West Saidapet, Chennai – 600 015

... Respondents

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 of B.N.S.S. to call for the entire records in pursuant to FIR in Crime No.41 of 2025, for the alleged offences under Sections 189(5) and 132 of the BNS, 2023 read with Section 71 (xi) of the City Police Act, and quash the same.



For Petitioners : Mr.A.Manojkumar

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

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed to quash the FIR in Crime No.41 of 2025, registered for the offences under Sections 189(5) and 132 of the BNS, 2023 read with Section 71 (xi) of the City Police Act, on the file of the first respondent police.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioners and a few others conducted a protest in front of the burial ground where the second respondent is working, for the reason that the second respondent had demanded money for discharging his official duty.

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 registered the aforesaid case. He would further submit that this Court, by order dated 30.04.2025 in Crl.O.P.No.13866 of 2025, has quashed the FIR as against the co-accused.

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 is about to file the final report.



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 of Cr.P.C./Section 528 of BNS, the Court should be slow in interfering and at the same time, if the Court finds from the entire materials collected by the prosecution that no offence is made out, directing the parties to undergo the ordeal of trial will be a futile exercise and it will infringe the right of the persons. In this regard, the Hon'ble Apex Court, in the oft-quoted judgment in ***State of Haryana and others Vs. Bhajan Lal and Others*** reported in ***1992 Supp (1) Supreme Court Cases 335***, has 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



WEB COPY



CrI.O.P.No.32335 of 2025

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 the expression ‘Unlawful Assembly’ in the IPC, which reads as under:

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 entitled to do.

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

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

8. In the present case, the accused had not shown any criminal force to commit any mischief, crime or any offence or by way of criminal force or



Crl.O.P.No.32335 of 2025

nor did they try to take possession of the property or right to use of incorporeal right which is in possession of enjoyment of others or rights.

9. Hence, this Criminal Original Petition stands allowed and the FIR in Crime No.41 of 2025, registered by the first respondent police, is hereby quashed in respect of the petitioners. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

27.11.2025

ksa-2

Neutral Citation:Yes/No



Crl.O.P.No.32335 of 2025

To

1. The Inspector of Police
Kumaran Nagar Police Station
Chennai
2. The Public Prosecutor
High Court of Madras, Chennai



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.32335 of 2025

A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA J.

ksa-2

Crl.O.P.No.32335 of 2025

27.11.2025.