



Contempt Petition No.3414 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 13.08.2026

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N. ANAND VENKATESH

Contempt Petition No.3414 of 2025

S.Manikkam

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. Sridhar
The Tahsildar,
The Tahsildar Office – South,
Salem.
2. The Tahsildar,
Salem.
(Suo motu impleaded as R2 as per the order
of this Court made in Cont.P.No.3414 of 2025
dated 17.10.2025)
3. The Inspector of Police,
CCB, Salem City.
(Suo motu impleaded as R3 as per the order
of this Court made in Cont.P.No.3414 of 2025
dated 22.01.2026)

... Respondents

PRAYER: Contempt Petition is filed under Section 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, to punish the respondent for willfully violating the orders of this Court in W.P.No.25163 of 2025 dated 10.07.2025.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Prabhu

For Respondents : Mr.Roshan Atiq.M
Additional Government Pleader for R1 & R2
Mr.Durai Gunasekaran
Government Counsel (Criminal Side) for R3



ORDER

WEB COPY

This Contempt petition has been filed against the respondents for wilful disobedience of the order dated 10.07.2025 passed by this Court in W.P.No.25163 of 2025.

2. When the matter was taken up for hearing today, the status report was placed before this Court by the third respondent. The relevant portions are extracted hereunder:-

“21. It is respectfully submitted that during the course of investigation, the summons under Section 41A of the Code of Criminal Procedure were served upon Nainamalai and Palanisamy on 30.01.2026, and upon their appearance they were examined during the course of investigation. In their statements, they claimed that they had not cultivated the disputed land as lessees but had been assisting the families of Manickam and Sadasivam by supplying grains, fruits, vegetables and financial assistance during festival occasions, and that, since the property was adjacent to their own land, they had negotiated the sale consideration and purchased the property. However, the investigation has revealed that Nainamalai and Palanisamy had, in fact, been cultivating the said property under a lease arrangement for nearly 25 years. The investigation has further disclosed that, with the intention



WEB COPY

of facilitating the fraudulent purchase of the property, Anbalagan, son of Nainamalai, fabricated a false death certificate and legal heir certificate and caused the sale deed to be prepared through the document writer Kumar. The attesting witnesses to the sale deed were Anbalagan and Palanisamy (aged about 70 years), son of Vaithiyagounder. During interrogation, Palanisamy confirmed that, after the sale consideration had been negotiated, he acted as a mediator and went to the residence of Sadasivam with the sale consideration to obtain his signature on the sale deed, but Sadasivam refused to execute the document stating that he would sign only after the arrival of his elder brother, Manickam. This statement is in direct contradiction to the version of Nainamalai, who claimed that he had personally taken the sale consideration to Sadasivam's house on the previous day.

22. It is further respectfully submitted that the contradictory statements of Nainamalai, Palanisamy and Anbalagan clearly establish that they acted in concert to deceive the families of Manickam and Sadasivam and fraudulently execute the impugned sale deed. During the preliminary enquiry, the document writer Kumar falsely claimed that Manickam and Sadasivam themselves had produced the relevant documents and instructed him to prepare the sale deed. However, during the subsequent investigation and confidential enquiry, it was revealed that the statement later given by Kumar before the Court



WEB COPY

under Section 164 CrPC was false. Palanisamy, son of Kuppusamy Gounder, stated that he and his brother Nainamalai had instructed Kumar to prepare the sale deed and that he had paid a sum of ₹10,000 towards document preparation charges, which was corroborated by Nainamalai.

23. It is further submitted that, a requisition has been submitted to the Mallasamudram Sub-Registrar Office seeking particulars as to whether the original title deed had been produced and verified at the time of registration of the sale deed. Summons under Section 41A CrPC were also served upon Anbalagan and Kumar, who appeared for enquiry and their statements were recorded. Since the records sought from the Tahsildar's Office and Salem Corporation are yet to be received.

24. It is further submitted that, the respondent police duly received the complaint and registered a case and conducted enquiry in a free, fair and impartial manner. Now the case is under investigation. As soon as complete the investigation and file a charge sheet before the competent court in accordance with law.”

3. The learned Government Counsel (Criminal Side) appearing for the impleaded third respondent has also produced the draft final report, wherein, the investigating officer/third respondent intends to file the final report against six named accused persons. He further submitted that the final report will be filed before the Court concerned shortly.



Contempt Petition No.3414 of 2025

WEB COPY

4. Recording the above, this Contempt Petition is closed.

13.08.2026

Neutral Citation: Yes/No
ham

To

1. The Tahsildar,
The Tahsildar Office – South,
Salem.
2. The Tahsildar,
Salem.
3. The Inspector of Police,
CCB, Salem City.



WEB COPY



Contempt Petition No.3414 of 2025

N. ANAND VENKATESH, J.

ham

Contempt Petition No.3414 of 2025

13.08.2026