WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 12-11-2026

CORAM

Case QR

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE G.K. ILANTHIRAIYAN

CRL OP No. 28388 of 2026 and Crl.M.P.No.18933 of 2026

CNR: {HCMA012377512026}

R.S Rajkumar
S/o Late Sugumaran,
No.6, Mariammanf Koil Street
Thandurai,Pattabiram,Tiruvallur District.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The State rep. by The Inspector of Police
   Pattabiram Police Station,
   Crime No.134 of 2026,
   Tiruvallur District.

2. S.Vijayakumari
   W/o Late Sugumaran,
   No.22, M.G.Road,
   Pattabiram-600072,
   Tiruvallur District.

..Respondent(s)

Prayer: This petition is filed under section 528 of BNS to call for the records relating to the criminal case in CC.No.734 of 2026 on the file of the Ld. Judicial Magistrate, Additional Mahila Court, Tiruvallur, Quash the same and pass such further order as this Honble Court deems fit and proper in the circumstances of the case and thus render justice.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.R.Darshan

For Respondent(s): MR.R.Ganesh Kumar, Additional Public Prosecutor.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

ORDER

This petition has been filed to quash the proceedings in C.C.No. 734 of 2026 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate, Additional Mahila Court, Tiruvallur.

2. On the complaint lodged by the second respondent, the first respondent registered a FIR in Crime No.134 of 2026 for the offences under Sections 126 (2) 296(b), 115(2) and 351(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, (hereinafter referred to as "BNS") and Section 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Woman (Amendment) Act, 2002. The petitioner is the younger son of the second respondent. It is alleged that the father of the petitioner has purchased properties and there was some property in the family, due to which a suit was initiated in O.S.No.241 of 2024 before the District Munsif at Poonamallee and the same is pending. The complainant further states that on the petitioner and other accused trespassed into the house of the second respondent and abused her and threatened her with dire consequences. With regard to the said occurrence the second respondent lodged a complaint before the first respondent and the same was registered in Crime No. 134 of 2026. On completion of investigation, the first respondent filed final report and the same has been taken cognizance by the trial Court in C.C.No. 734 of 2026 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate, Additional Mahila Court, Tiruvallur, for the offences

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

punishable under Sections 126 (2) 296(b), 115(2) and 351(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023. To quash the said proceedings, the present petition has been filed.

3. Heard the learned counsel appearing on either side and perused the materials placed before this Court.

4. Admittedly, there is property dispute between the petitioner and the defacto complainant. In this regard already they filed suit in O.S.No.241 of 2024 before the District Munsif at Poonamallee. That apart, the petitioner also filed complaint as against the husband of the second respondent. On perusal of the statement recorded under Section 180 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (hereinafter referred to as “BNSS”), revealed that there are contrary between the facts and circumstances. Further there is no specific allegations alleging that the petitioner scolded the defacto complainant and others used filthy language.

5. In order to attract the offence under Section 296(b) of BNS, there must be an uttering of words to affect the person who lodged the complaint. In this regard it is relevant to extract the Section 296(b) of BNS, as follows :-

> "*296. Obscene acts and songs —Whoever, to the annoyance of others—*

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

(a) does any obscene act in any public place, or

(b) sings, recites or utters any obscene song, ballad or words, in or near any public place, shall be punished with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to three months, or with fine which may extend to one thousand rupees, or with both."

6.Admittedly, there is absolutely no words uttered by the petitioners as such to constitute the offence under Section 296(b) of BNS, there is no averments and allegations. Further the charges do not show that on hearing the obscene words, which were allegedly uttered by the petitioners, the witnesses felt annoyed. No one has spoken about the obscene words, they felt annoyed and in the absence of legal evidence to show that the words uttered by the petitioners annoyed others, it can not be said that the ingredients of the offence under Section 296(b) of BNS is made out.

7. In this regard, it is relevant to rely upon the judgment reported in ***2025 SCC OnLine SC 238*** in the case of ***Om Prakash Ambedkar Vs. State of Maharastra and ors,*** in which the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India held that the test of obscenity under Section 296(b) of BNS is whether the tendency of the matter charged as obscenity is to deprave and corrupt those, whose minds are open to such immoral influences. This Court finds that the words uttered in this

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

case have such a tendency. The words are defamatory about the complainant but this Court doesn't think that the words are obscene and the utterance would constitute an offence punishable under Section 296(b) of BNS. Further it has to be noted in the present case in the absence of words which will involve some lascivious elements arousing sexual thoughts or feelings or words cannot attract the offence under Section 296(b) of BNS. Mere abusive, humiliating or defamative words by itself cannot attract an offence under Section 296(b) of BNS. Therefore, there must be a further proof to establish that it was to the annoyance of others, which is lacking in the case. No one has spoken about the obscene words, they felt annoyed and in the absence of legal evidence to show that the words uttered by the accused annoyed others, it cannot be said that the ingredients of the offence under Section 296(b) of BNS is made out. Therefore, no case is made out as against the petitioners to attract the offence under Section 296(b) of BNS.

8. Insofar as the offence under Section 351(3) of BNS is concerned, threat should be a real one and not just a mere words when the person uttering does not exactly mean what he says and also when the person to whom threat is launched does not feel threatened actually. Whereas, in the case on hand, there is no averment to attract the offence under Section 351(3) of BNS.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

9. Accordingly, the Criminal Original Petition stands allowed and the proceedings in C.C.No.734 of 2026 pending on the file of the Judicial Magistrate, Additional Mahila Court, Tiruvallur is hereby quashed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition are closed.

12-11-2026

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Neutral Citation: Yes/No

SMN

To.

1. The Judicial Magistrate, Additional Mahila Court, Tiruvallur

2. The Inspector of Police
Pattabiram Police Station,Tiruvallur District.

3. The Public Prosecutor, High Court, Madras

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN, J.

SMN

CRL OP No. 28388 of 2026 and
Crl.M.P.No.18933 of 2026

12-11-2026

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis