

Ramasamy Vs The State of Tamil Nadu, Inspector of Police,

Ramasamy Vs The State of Tamil Nadu, Inspector of Police,

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1433821

Court : Chennai

Decided On : Mar-26-2026

Judge : Honourable Mr Justice a.D.Jagadish Chandira

Appeal No. : CRL OP(MD)/5409/2026

Appellant : Ramasamy

Respondent : The State of Tamil Nadu, Inspector of Police,

Judgement :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 26.03.2026

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA Ramasamy
...Petitioner Vs.

1. State of Tamil Nadu rep. by, The Inspector of Police, Crime No.719 of
2020.

2. The Sub-Inspector of Police, Virudhunagar District. ...Respondents

Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita/Section 482 Cr.P.C., to call for the records in Crime No.719 of 2020 on the file of the 1 st respondent police and quash the same. For Petitioner : Ms.R.Kaviya Sri For Respondents : Mr.S.Udayakumar, GA(Crl. Side)

ORDER

This criminal original petition has been filed seeking to quash the FIR in Crime No.719 of 2020, pending on the file of the 1 st respondent police.

2. Based on the complaint given by the de facto complainant

alleging that on 04.12.2020 at about 10.45 am, when the de facto complainant and the other officials were conducting routine patrol duty, about 150 persons assembled unlawfully without obtaining prior permission and protested against the agricultural bills, in a manner causing disturbance to the public, a case in Crime No.719 of 2020 was registered by the 1st respondent-police for the offences under Sections 143 & 341 of IPC, which is now sought to be quashed.

3. The maximum punishment prescribed for the aforesaid offences

are tabulated hereunder: Sections Punishment 143 IPC Imprisonment may extend to six months, or with fine, or with both 341 IPC Imprisonment may extend to one month or with fine which may extend to Rs.500/- or with both

4. Though very many grounds have been raised, the learned

counsel for the petitioner submitted that in respect of the aforesaid offences, the investigation ought to have been completed and the final report should have been filed within a period of one year from the date of registration of the FIR, as mandated under Section 468 Cr.P.C. In the present case, though the FIR has been registered as early as on 04.12.2020, even after a lapse of about six years, the final report has not

been filed till date and therefore, the same is barred by limitation. Hence, the continuation of the proceedings against the petitioner is an abuse of process of law and therefore, on this sole ground, the impugned FIR is liable to be quashed.

5. He further submitted that the facts of the instant case are similar

to the facts of the cases in Jeevanandham and others vs. The Inspector of Police, Velayuthampalayam Police Station, Karur District reported in (2018 2 LW (Crl) 606) and Sri Raja vs Inspector of Police, Sivakasi Town Police Station Virudhunagar District and others (Crl.O.P(MD) No.7922 of 2019, decided on 30.08.2019), in which the proceedings were quashed.

6. Learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the

respondent-police endorsed the aforesaid submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner that the facts of the instant case are akin to the facts in the aforesaid two cases and he fairly submitted that the final report is yet to be filed before the Court concerned.

7. Heard the learned counsel on either side and perused the materials available on record.

8. For the punishments set out in paragraph 3 supra, the final

report ought to have been filed within one year from the date of registration of the FIR, as per Section 468(2)(b) of Cr.P.C. However, in the instant case, the final report has not yet been filed, even after a lapse of six years from the date of registration of FIR.

9. Further, this Court is of the opinion that the abovesaid two

decisions relied on by the learned counsel for the petitioner would apply on all fours to the present case and that no useful purpose will be served by keeping the impugned FIR in Crime No.719 of 2020 pending and hence, the same is liable to be quashed. Further, though this petition has been filed by the petitioner alone, no

useful purpose would be served by allowing the proceedings to continue against the remaining accused, who are all similarly placed, and it is an abuse of process of law.

10. Ergo, for the aforesaid two reasons, this criminal original petition stands allowed and the FIR in Crime No.719 of 2020, pending on the file of the 1st respondent-police, is hereby quashed in entirety. 26.03.2026 skt Neutral Citation: Yes/No To:

1. The Inspector of Police,
2. The Sub-Inspector of Police,
3. The Public Prosecutor, High Court of Madras.

A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.

skt 26.03.2026

SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com