



CRL.OP.No.19091 of 2026

WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 20-07-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY

CRL.OP.No.19091 of 2026
and CRL.MP.No.12720 of 2026

1. Pachamuthu
2. Jayaraj
3. Vairamani
4. Rajendhri

..Petitioner(s)

Vs.

1. State rep. by The Inspector of Police,
Muathandikuppam Police Station,
Cuddalore District.
(Crime No.55 of 2026.)

2. Rajalakshmi

..Respondent(s)

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS, praying to call for the entire records pertaining to Crime No.55 of 2026 on the file of the Sub Inspector of Police, Muthandikuppam Police Station, Cuddalore Ditrect, and quash the same as against the petitioners.

For Petitioner(s):

Mr.S.Anburaja

For Respondent(s):

Mr.R.Rajasekaran, (for R1)
Counsel for Government of Tamil Nadu
(Crl.Side)



CRL.OP.No.19091 of 2026

ORDER

WEB COPY

The prayer made in this criminal original petition is to quash the First Information Report (FIR) in Crime No.55 of 2026 dated 02.04.2026.

2. The prayer sought in this petition is innocuous in nature, and as such, this petition is being disposed of at the admission stage itself, without ordering notice to the second respondent.

3. Upon perusing the FIR, the allegations of the de facto complainant reveal that she had developed a relationship with one Mayakrishnan, the husband of the 4th petitioner herein. It is alleged that all these petitioners surrounded the de facto complainant, abused her, attacked her with their hands and legs and pulled her saree, thereby harassing her. Hence, the case was registered.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that even after an earlier complaint was closed, the de facto complainant persisted in pursuing a relationship with Mayakrishnan. He further submitted that the present complaint was filed purely to wreak vengeance, threaten the petitioners and cover up her own illegal acts when questioned.



WEB COPY

5. Heard the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioners as well as the learned counsel for Government of Tamil Nadu (Criminal Side) appearing for the first respondent police.

6. The defence of the petitioners is that the allegations are entirely false. However, it is now well settled that at the stage of registration of a case, the respondent police cannot pronounce upon the veracity of the allegations, as it is a subject matter of investigation. The argument of the learned counsel for the petitioners that the first petitioner is 69 years old and suffers from a locomotor disability, can also be considered during the course of the investigation.

7. Since the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioners are purely factual in nature and do not fall within any of the parameters laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in *State of Haryana and others Vs. Bhajan Lal and others* reported in *1992 Supp (1) Supreme Court Cases 335*, this is not a fit case to entertain the quash petition and thwart the investigation at its inception.



CRL.OP.No.19091 of 2026

WEB COPY

8. However, by keeping open the liberty of the petitioners to raise all available grounds during the course of the investigation, this criminal original petition stands closed. The Investigating Officer shall specifically look into the averments made with reference to the first petitioner regarding his locomotor disability and his physical inability to assault or kick the de facto complainant as alleged. Connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

20-07-2026

Neutral Citation: No

Sni



CRL.OP.No.19091 of 2026

WEB COPY

To

1.The Inspector of Police,
Muathandikuppam Police Station,
Cuddalore District.

2.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



CRL.OP.No.19091 of 2026

D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY, J.

Sni

CRL.OP.No.19091 of 2026

20-07-2026

Page6 of 6