



CRL OP(MD). No.20004 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.20004 of 2025

and

CrI.M.P.(MD).Nos.16896 & 16897 of 2025

1. Senthil Kumar,
2. Magesh,
3. Santhosh Kumar,
4. Srir Ram,
5. Kesavan,
6. Esar @ Eshwar,
7. Bapitha @ Papitha,
8. Abinaya @ Kalaiselvi,
9. Pavithra @ Preeethi,
10. Dayana @ Helan Angel Mary,

... Petitioners

Vs.

1. The State of Tamilnadu Rep.By,
The Inspector of Police,
Thuvakkudi Police Station,
Trichy District.
(Cr.No.198 of 2024).

2. K.Thirunavukarasu,
The Sub Inspector of Police,
Thuvakkudi Police Station,
Trichy District.

... Respondents



CRL OP(MD). No.20004 of 2025

PRAYER :- This Petition is filed under section 528 BNSS, to call for the records relating to the proceedings in STC No.7551 of 2025 on the file of Learned Judicial Magistrate No.VI, Trichy West dated 07.10.2024 and quash the same.

For Petitioners : Mr.Kaleeswaran.N,

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

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed to quash the impugned final report filed for the offences under Sections 189(2), 126 and 223 BNS (Corresponding to Sections 143, 341 and 188 I.P.C).

2. The allegation in the final report is that the petitioners, 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 petitioners would submit that the petitioners, along with others, was exercising their right to assemble



CRL OP(MD). No.20004 of 2025

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 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***.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the first respondent, per contra, would submit that the petitioners, 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 indulge in the protest and therefore, the impugned final report is justified.

5. The admitted fact is that the petitioners, along with others, indulged 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 189(2), 126 and 223 BNS (Corresponding to Sections 143, 341 and 188 I.P.C), 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



CRL OP(MD). No.20004 of 2025

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 the Hon'ble Supreme Court and of this Court would squarely apply to the facts of the instant case and hence, the offences under Sections 189(2), 126 and 223 BNS (Corresponding to Sections 143, 341 and 188 I.P.C) would not be made out on the allegations. Hence, this Court is of the view that the impugned final report is liable to be quashed and is accordingly quashed.

10. In the result, this Criminal Original Petition is allowed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

17.11.2025

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

1. The Judicial Magistrate No.VI,
Trichy.



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No.20004 of 2025

SUNDER MOHAN,J

LS

2.The Inspector of Police,
Thuvakkudi Police Station,
Trichy District

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

CRL OP(MD) No.20004 of 2025

17.11.2025