



Crl.O.P(MD)No.6550 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 27.02.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE L.VICTORIA GOWRI

Crl.O.P(MD)No.6550 of 2025

and

Crl.M.P(MD)No.4778 of 2025

C.Krishnamoorthi

... Petitioner/A7

Vs.

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep.by the Inspector of Police,
Dindigul North Town Police Station,
Dindigul.
(Crime No.801/2015)

... Respondent/Complainant

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023, to call for the records connected with the case in S.T.C.No. 714 of 2015 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate No.II, Dindigul and quash the same as illegal as against the petitioner.

For Petitioner : Mr.A.Prabhu Raj

For Respondent : Mr.M.Sakthi Kumar
Government Advocate(Crl.Side)



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P(MD)No.6550 of 2025

ORDER

Seeking quashment of the final report in S.T.C.No. 714 of 2015 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate No.II, Dindigul, this criminal original petition is filed.

2. On 10.07.2015 at about 11.15 a.m, the petitioner along with co-accused allegedly unlawfully assembled in front of the Dindigul Corporation Office demanding total prohibition of alcohol. During the protest, they reportedly obstructed traffic, caused inconvenience to the public and intercepted vehicles, leading to the registration of F.I.R in Crime No.801 of 2015 for the offences under Sections 143, 341 and 188 IPC.

3. Upon completion of investigation, a final report was filed before the learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Dindigul and the same was taken on file as S.T.C.No.714 of 2015 for the offences under Sections 143, 341 and 188 IPC.



Crl.O.P(MD)No.6550 of 2025

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner contend that the impugned final report suffers from fundamental illegality and does not disclose the commission of any cognizable offence. The petitioner submit that the alleged protest was conducted peacefully and that peaceful expression of opinion 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.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the final report does not contain any specific overt act attributable to the petitioner. The final report does not whisper any material to show that the petitioner indulged in violence, caused disturbance, annoyance or obstruction to any public authority or to the general public.

6. It is further argued that the allegations in the final report are vague, sweeping and intended only to portray a peaceful assembly as



Crl.O.P(MD)No.6550 of 2025

illegal. Criminal law cannot be invoked to curtail peaceful expression, which is the bedrock of democratic governance.

7. Per contra, the learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side), on the other hand, submitted that the petitioner had assembled without permission, blocked a public road, and caused inconvenience, and therefore, the prosecution is justified. It was contended that the truthfulness of the allegations can be tested only during trial.

8. Heard the learned counsels on either side and carefully perused the materials available on record.

9. Section 143 IPC requires a prima facie indication that the person was a member of an unlawful assembly as defined, i.e., an assembly with a common object falling within Section 141 IPC. In a protest-related FIR, merely stating that a group assembled, without particulars of common object vis-à-vis each accused, and without any



material indicating participation beyond presence, is insufficient to fasten criminality on an individual.

10. Section 341 IPC contemplates “wrongful restraint”, which must be shown by allegations indicating that the accused voluntarily obstructed a person so as to prevent that person from proceeding in any direction in which that person had a right to proceed. The final report in the present case does not identify the person restrained by the petitioner, the place of restraint, or the act of restraint attributable to them.

11. Section 188 of IPC deals with disobedience to an order lawfully issued by a public servant. The F.I.R discloses none.

12. Article 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.

13. The ingredients of Sections 143, 341 and 188 IPC are not made out in the final report. Criminal law cannot be invoked on vague and omnibus allegations, particularly when the allegations seek to criminalise peaceful expression. The present final report appears to have been registered mechanically and without application of mind.

14. 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.

15. 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.



Crl.O.P(MD)No.6550 of 2025

WEB COPY

16. In the result, the Criminal Original Petition is allowed. The final report in STC No.714 of 2015 on the file of Learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Dindigul is quashed insofar as the petitioner is concerned. Consequently, the connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

27.02.2026

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

gbg

To

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Dindigul
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
Dindigul North Town Police Station,
Dindigul.
- 3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P(MD)No.6550 of 2025

L.VICTORIA GOWRI, J.

gbg

Crl.O.P(MD)No.6550 of 2025

27.02.2026