



CRL OP(MD). No.2658 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

Dated : 10/02/2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE L. VICTORIA GOWRI

CRL OP(MD). No.2658 of 2026

N.Kanagaraj,

... Petitioner

Vs

1. The State of Tamilnadu,
Rep by the Inspector of Police,
Palani Town Police Station,
Palani,
Dindigul District.

2. Leelavathi,
Sivagiripatti Village Administrative Officer,
Sivagiripatti Village,
Palani Taluk,
Dindigul District..

... Respondents

PRAYER :- To call for the records pertaining to the case in Crime No. 574 of 2022 on the file of the 1st respondent police herein and quash the same.

For Petitioner : Mr. S.Karthik,
For Respondent : Mr.S.Ravi,
Additional Public Prosecutor



CRL OP(MD). No.2658 of 2026

ORDER

WEB COPY

The petitioner seeks for quash of the FIR in Crime No.574 of 2022, on the file of the first respondent.

2. The case of the prosecution, as reflected in the First Information Report is that the petitioner and other accused were protesting by unlawfully blocking the road without obtaining any prior permission from the respondent police, causing nuisance to the general public. On the basis of the complaint given by the second respondent, the respondent police registered a case in Crime No.574 of 2022 for the alleged offences under Sections 143 and 341 of IPC.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the impugned FIR suffers from fundamental illegality and does not disclose the commission of any cognizable offence and that the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the campaign was conducted peacefully and that right of expression is a constitutionally guaranteed right under Article 19(1)(a) of the Constitution of India. It is their case that expressing one's views in a democratic nation cannot be criminalised, unless the act satisfies the ingredients of a penal provision.



CRL OP(MD). No.2658 of 2026

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner further submitted that the FIR does not contain any specific overt act attributable to any of the petitioner. The complaint does not disclose an unlawful assembly. The petitioner is a social workers and the FIR has been registered on 01.11.2022 and till now it has not been sent to Judicial Magistrate for further process. Therefore, the essential ingredients of Sections 143 of IPC is not maintainable.

5. Further the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that (i) since no public was affected; (ii) no intention of causing danger to the public or (iii) obstruction to the public, the offence under Section 341 of IPC would not attract.

6. It is further argued that the allegations in the FIR are vague, sweeping and intended only to portray a peaceful assembly as illegal. Criminal law cannot be invoked to curtail peaceful expression, which is the bedrock of democratic governance.



CRL OP(MD). No.2658 of 2026

7. Per contra, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent police submitted that based on the complaint received, the respondent police registered the FIR. According to him, the petitioner has an effective remedy of participating in the investigation rather than seeking quashing at this stage.

8. I have considered the submissions of both sides and perused the materials placed on record. A careful reading of the FIR reveals that no specific overt act has been attributed to the petitioner. There is no allegation of violence, obstruction, public nuisance or disturbance.

9. Articles 19(1)(a) and 19(1)(b) of the Constitution guarantee freedom of speech and expression, and the right to peaceful assembly without arms. These rights can be restricted only by reasonable restrictions provided by law. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has consistently held that peaceful protest is a recognized democratic right, and criminal prosecution cannot be launched unless the alleged act squarely falls within the ingredients of a penal offence.



CRL OP(MD). No.2658 of 2026

10. The ingredients of Sections 143 & 341 of IPC are not made out in the FIR. Criminal law cannot be invoked on vague and omnibus allegations, particularly when the allegations seek to criminalise peaceful expression. The present FIR appears to have been registered mechanically and without application of mind.

11. In view of the authoritative pronouncements cited by the petitioner and considering the facts of the present case, this Court finds that the continuation of the investigation against the petitioner would amount to abuse of process of law.

12. Accordingly, this Court is inclined to exercise its inherent powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C., 1973 (corresponding provision of Section 528 of BNSS) to secure the ends of justice.

13. In the result, the Criminal Original Petition is allowed. The FIR in Crime No.574 of 2022 on the file of the first respondent police is quashed insofar as the petitioner herein is concerned.

10.02.2026

NCC : Yes / No

Index : Yes / No

tta



CRL OP(MD). No.2658 of 2026

WEB COPY **TO:-**

1. The Inspector of Police,
Palani Town Police Station,
Palani,
Dindigul District.
2. Leelavathi,
Sivagiripatti Village Administrative Officer,
Sivagiripatti Village,
Palani Taluk,
Dindigul District..
3. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No.2658 of 2026

L. VICTORIA GOWRI,J

tta

**ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.2658 of 2026**

Date : 10/02/2026