



CRL OP(MD). No.20057 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

Dated : 17.11.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

CRL OP(MD). No.20057 of 2025

and

CrI.MP(MD)Nos.16934 & 16935 of 2025

Kumaresan,

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. State of Tamilnadu Rep by
Inspector of Police,
Namanasamuthiram Police Station,
Pudukkottai District.
(Crime No.41/2017).

2. Belicks Raj,,
Village Administrative Officer,
Thekkattur,
Thirumayam Taluk,
Pudukkottai District.

... Respondents

PRAYER :- This Petition is filed under section 528 BNSS, to call for the records pertaining to charge sheet in S.T.C. No.359 of 2024 on the file of learned District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Thirumayam and quash the same as illegal.

For Petitioner : Mr.G.Mathavan,

For Respondents : Mr.R.Meenakshi Sundaram,
Additional Public Prosecutor for R1



CRL OP(MD). No.20057 of 2025

ORDER

WEB COPY

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed to quash the impugned final report in S.T.C. No.359 of 2024 on the file of learned District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Thirumayam, which was filed for the offences under Sections 341, 143 and 283 of IPC.

2. The allegation in the final report is that the petitioner, along with others, indulged in a protest without valid permission and caused nuisance and disturbance to the general public, besides causing obstruction to traffic.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner, along with others, was exercising his right to assemble peacefully and had registered the protest, which could not, by any stretch of imagination, constitute the offences alleged. He would rely upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case 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 **2018-2-L.W.(Crl.) 606**.



CRL OP(MD). No.20057 of 2025

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the first respondent, per contra, would submit that the petitioner, along with others, participated in the protest and caused obstruction to traffic, besides causing nuisance and disturbance to the general public; and that they had no valid permission to engage in the protest and therefore, the impugned final report is justified.

5. The admitted fact is that the petitioner, along with others, engaged in a protest. The question is whether the assembly of persons and their protest on an issue 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, 341 and 188 of IPC, this Court had held as follows:

32.Crl.O.P.(MD)Nos. 12684, 15710 and 15709 of 2018

In all these cases, a Final Report has been filed for an offence under Section 143, 341 and 188 of IPC. A Final Report cannot be filed for an offence under



Section 188 of IPC, and the Court below ought not to have been taken cognizance. In view of the above discussion, the Final Report insofar as an offence under Section 188 IPC is concerned is hereby quashed. Insofar as the offence under Section 143 IPC is concerned, the allegation is that the assembly had raised slogans demanding for the rights of the farmers, and expressed opposition not to establish a godown and this according to the Police was done, when there was a prohibitory order under Section 30(2) of the Police Act, 1861. In the considered view of this Court, this will not constitute an offence under Section 143 of IPC.

2.In all the cases, the assembly of persons were expressing dissatisfaction on 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. A reading of the Final Report also does not make out an offence under Section 341 of Cr.P.C since any form of an agitation, will necessarily cause some hindrance to the movement of the general public for sometime. That by itself, does not constitute an offence of a wrongful restraint.”

8. The above observations of this Court would squarely apply to the facts of the instant case. Further, there is nothing to suggest the commission of an offence under Section 283 of the IPC. Even otherwise,



CRL OP(MD). No.20057 of 2025

the alleged acts caused only slight harm and the offence under Section 283 IPC is punishable with fine of Rs.200/-. Hence, no useful purpose would be served by continuing the prosecution.

9. Hence, this Court is inclined to quash the impugned prosecution. This Criminal Original Petition is allowed and the impugned final report is hereby quashed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

17.11.2025

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

TO

1.The District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate,
Thirumayam

2.The Inspector of Police,
Namanasamuthiram Police Station,
Pudukkottai District.

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

5/6



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No.20057 of 2025

SUNDER MOHAN,J

LS

CRL OP(MD) No.20057 of 2025

17.11.2025