



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.19606 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 10.11.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

Crl.O.P.(MD).No.19606 of 2025

and

Crl.M.P(MD)No.16395 of 2025

1. C. Arockiyasamy

2. Johnkennadi

3. Francis

4. Murugan.C

5. Ragu

6. V.Thennavan

7. P.Vairavan

8. Moorthi

9. Nallathambi

... Petitioners/Accused 1-6, 8, 9 & 10

Vs.

The State of Tamilnadu,
represented by the Special Sub Inspector of Police,
Batlagundu,
Batlagundu Police Station,
Dindigul City.

... Respondent/Complainant



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.19606 of 2025

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023, to call for the records relating to the impugned final report filed in C.C.No.198 of 2017 on the file of learned Judicial Magistrate Court, Nilakottai, Dindigul, concerned in Crime No.67 of 2017 on the file of Special Sub Inspector of Police, Batlagundu Police Station, Dindigul City and in so far as the petitioners are concerned, quash the same and allow this petition.

For Petitioners : Mr.K.Muthu Ganesa Pandian
For Respondent : Mr.R.Meenakshi Sundaram
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed to quash the impugned final report in C.C.No.198 of 2017 on the file of learned Judicial Magistrate Court, Nilakottai, Dindigul, which was filed for the offences under Section 143 and 188 of IPC.

2. The allegation in the impugned final report is that the petitioners and another, indulged in a protest without valid permission and caused nuisance and disturbance to the general public.

3. *The learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners along with another were exercising their right to assemble*



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.19606 of 2025

peacefully, which could not, by any stretch of imagination, constitute the offences alleged. He would rely upon the judgment of this Court in the case of Jeevanandham and others vs. State rep. by Inspector of Police, Velayuthampalayam Police Station, Karur District and another, reported in 2018 SCC OnLine Mad 13698 in support of his submissions.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent, per contra, would submit that the petitioners, along with another, participated in an unauthorized protest and caused obstruction to traffic, besides causing nuisance and disturbance to the general public; and therefore, the impugned final report is justified.

5. Admittedly, the petitioners, along with others, participated in a protest. The question is whether such an act would constitute the offences alleged by the prosecution.

6. In the case of **Jeevanandham**, referred to supra, which related to a protest without valid permission and when the accused had filed quash petition of the final report filed for the offences under Sections 143 and 188 of IPC, this Court had held as follows:



"35.Crl.O.P.(MD)No.11836 of 2018:-

WEB COPY

In this case, the Final Report has been filed only for an offence under Section 143 of Cr.P.C and the Court below has taken cognizance of the Final Report. A reading of the allegations made in the Final Report would show that a group of persons were agitating for non supply of the essential commodities in a ration shop. In this case, the FIR was registered under Section 143 and 188 of IPC. The Final Report was filed for an offence under Section 143 of IPC. Insofar as the offence under Section 143 of IPC is concerned, the concerned Police Officer has quoted Section 30(2) of the Police Act, and therefore, has straight away proceeded to register an FIR under Section 143 of IPC. As stated above, a mere violation of the so-called promulgation under Section 30(2) of the Police Act will not make out an offence under Section 143 of IPC by straight away declaring an assembly of persons to be an unlawful assembly. The power under Section 30(2) of the Police Act is merely regulatory in nature. In fact, Section 32 of the Police Act itself provides for a penalty for disobeying an order issued under Section 30(2) of the Police Act with a punishment of a fine not exceeding 200 rupees, where as an offence under Section 143 of IPC is punishable with imprisonment for a term which may extend to 6 months. Therefore, a violation of the so-called promulgation under Section 30(2) of the Police Act will not by itself constitute an offence under Section 143 of IPC. In this case, the assembly of persons were made to express dissatisfaction of the governance and claiming for minimum rights that are guaranteed to an ordinary citizen. If such an assembly of persons are to be trifled by registering an FIR under Section 143 of IPC and filing a Final Report for the very same offence, no democratic dissent can ever be shown by the citizens and such prohibition will amount to violation of fundamental rights guaranteed under the Constitution."

7. The above observations of this Court would squarely apply to the facts of the instant case. Further, there is nothing to indicate that the petitioner



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.19606 of 2025

intended to cause public nuisance. Hence, no useful purpose would be served in continuing the prosecution.

8. Since the allegation does not constitute any of the offences, this Court is of the view that the impugned final report in C.C.No.198 of 2017 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate Court, Nilakottai, Dindigul, is liable to be quashed and is accordingly quashed.

9. In the result, this Criminal Original Petition is allowed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

10.11.2025

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes/ No

Indu

To

1.The Judicial Magistrate Court, Nilakottai,
Dindigul.

2.The Special Sub Inspector of Police,
Batlagundu,
Batlagundu Police Station,
Dindigul City.

3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

5/6



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.19606 of 2025

SUNDER MOHAN, J.

Indu

Crl.O.P(MD).No.19606 of 2025

10.11.2025