



WEB COPY

**BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT**

**DATED :06.04.2026**

**CORAM:**

**THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE R.VIJAYAKUMAR**

**CRL.O.P(MD)No.6635 of 2026**

**and**

**CRL.M.P(MD)Nos.7199 and 7200 of 2026**

Jeba Akash Vinith @ Vinith ... Petitioner/ Accused No.37

.Vs.

1.The State of Tamil Nadu,  
represented by the Inspector of Police,  
Koodankulam Police Station,  
Tirunelveli District.  
(Crime No.158 of 2018). ...Respondent/Complainant

2.Jeyakrishnanb ... Respondent/De-facto complainant

**PRAYER:** Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023, praying this Court to call for the records and quash the charge sheet pending on the file of Judicial Magistrate Court, Radhapurm, Tirunelveli District in P.R.C.No.26 of 2025.

For Petitioner : Mr.K.Sudalaiyandi

For Respondent-1 :Mr.B.Thanga Aravindh  
Govt.Advocate(Crl.side)

**ORDER**



WEB COPY

The present petition has been filed by the accused No.37 in P.R.C.No.26 of 2025, on the file of Judicial Magistrate Court, Radhapuram, Tirunelveli District, wherein, the Petitioner has been charge sheeted for the offences under Sections 147, 148,341,342,294(b),353 and 506(ii) of IPC and Section 3 of the TNPPDL Act, 1992.

2.A perusal of the charge sheet reveals that the Petitioner is said to have charge sheeted for agitation and they have blocked the bus and damaged the same. A perusal of the charge sheet further reveals that in another part of the city when the Police party was shooting down the persons, the Petitioner and others have entered into agitation, blocked the bus and harassed the general public.

3.The learned counsel for the Petitioner submitted that no specific overt-act was attributed against each one of the persons and the allegations are vague in nature. A26 and A32 already filed CrI.OP(MD)No.10608 of 2024 and the charge sheet against them was quashed on 9.12.2023.He further submitted that the Petitioner is on the same footing.



WEB COPY

4.Per contra, the learned Government Advocate(Crl.Side) appearing for the first respondent submitted that the Petitioner and others have damaged the Government bus and therefore the Petitioner cannot be said to be on the same footing as that of the accused in whose favour FIR was quashed.

5.I have heard the submissions made on either side and perused the materials placed before this Court.

6.A perusal of the FIR reveals that on the fateful day, the Police firing was conducted and more than 10 persons passed away, wherein, in the other part of the city, the Petitioner and others are said to have blocked the bus due to the death of the other persons.A26 and A32 already filed Crl.O.P(MD)No.10608 of 2024 before this Court and charge sheet against them was quashed on 9.12.2025. Paragrah No.14 to 16 of the above said judgment in Crl.O.P(MD)No.10608 of 2025 is extracted hereunder:

*“14.A bare reading of the FIR reveals that the defacto complainant admittedly does not know the accused persons and that the complaint speaks of “accused Nos.1 to 45 and other unknown persons”, without assigning any specific role to any individual. It is well settled that criminal law cannot be set into motion on vague omnibus and sweeping allegations, particularly, when identity itself is uncertain.*

*15.The FIR was registered belatedly on 26.5.2018, whereas, the alleged occurrence is said to have taken place on 22.5.2018.The delay has*



*not been satisfactorily explained and assumes significance in the facts of the present case. More importantly, even after a lapse of more than six years, no final report or charge sheet has been filed. This prolonged inaction on the part of the investigating agency clearly demonstrates that there is no material worth proceeding further.*

*16.This Court cannot lose sight of the fact that during the Sterlite agitation, several FIRs were registered indiscriminately and many such cases have been subsequently quashed by this Court including by the Division Bench in W.P.No.3609 of 2021, dated 21.09.2021. The inherent power of this Court is meant to prevent abuse of the process of law and to secure the ends of justice. Permitting the present FIR to linger indefinitely would cause serious prejudice, mental agony and irreparable injury to the Petitioners. The continuation of the proceedings, in the absence of any concrete materials, would serve no useful purpose and would only result in harassment of the Petitioners."*

7.The Petitioner also stand on the same footing and there is no specific overtact attributed against the Petitioner. In view of the above said facts, continuation of criminal proceedings would be an abuse of process of law.

8.In view of the above said facts, charge sheet in P.R.C.No.26 of 2025, on the file of Judicial Magistrate Court, Radhapuram, Tirunelveli District, stands quashed as against the Petitioner alone and the Criminal Original Petition stands allowed. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petitions are closed.

**06.04.2026**



NCS : Yes/No  
Index : Yes / No  
Internet : Yes / No

vsn

To

1.The Judicial Magistrate,  
Radhapuram,  
Tirunelveli District.

2.The Inspector of Police,  
Koodankulam Police Station,  
Tirunelveli District.  
(Crime No.158 of 2018).

Copy to

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



WEB COPY



**R.VIJAYAKUMAR.,J.**

vsn

**ORDER MADE IN**  
**CRL.O.P(MD)No.6635 of 2026**  
**and**  
**CRL.M.P(MD)Nos.7199 and 7200 of 2026**



WEB COPY



**06.04.2026**