



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

Dated : 11.08.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE DR. JUSTICE P. MURUGAN

WP(MD). No.300 of 2024

V.Ramasamy

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Superintendent of Police,
Tirunelveli District.

2.The Inspector of Police,
Ambasamudram Police Station,
Tirunelveli District.

3.V.Kannan

4.K.Sankareswari @ Santhi

... Respondents

PRAYER :- This Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to direct the 1st and 2nd respondents to take action on the petitioner's complaint dated 29.09.2023 under criminal law in the light of the dictum laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of Lalita Kumari Vs. Government of Uttar Pradesh reported in (2014) 2 SCC 1.



For Petitioner : Mr.R.Anand

For Respondents : Mr.C.Christopher
Government Advocate (Crl.side)
for R1 & R2

: Mr.C.Sundaravadivel
for R3 & R4

ORDER

This Writ Petition is filed to direct the respondents 1 & 2 to take action on the petitioner's complaint dated 29.09.2023 under criminal law in the light of the decision of the *Lalita Kumari Vs. Government of Uttar Pradesh reported in (2014) 2 SCC 1*.

2. The petitioner alleged in support of the affidavit that his father died on 22.10.2021 as if it was an accident. Thereafter, it was relied upon by the petitioner that his own brother / 3rd respondent and his wife / 4th respondent decided to murder his father on the ground that his father had already executed a Will dated 18.04.2018 bequeathing his property in favour of his son 3rd respondent. During his life time, the testator cancelled the Will on 24.02.2020. Taking vengeance over his



WEB COPY

father that he cancelled the Will which stood in favour of the third respondent, the petitioner thought that the third respondent along with his wife could have murdered his father, whereas he gave a complaint before the respondents 1 & 2 to take action against the respondents 3 & 4. Having received no response from the police for nearly three years, this Writ Petition has been filed seeking the relief as sought for.

3. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) submitted that on receipt of the petition from the petitioner, the police enquired the matter on 07.10.2023 itself and stated that, the accused who is the third respondent in this petition has been enquired and recorded his statement.

4. It was decided by the police that there is no *prima facie* case to proceed further, wherein the petitioner has filed a suspicious complaint. Therefore, the petition enquiry was closed on 07.10.2023 itself. However, the copy of the closure report was not served on the petitioner at the first instance itself.

5. Since the petitioner's complaint was enquired and closed, this Writ Petition is disposed of. However, liberty is given to the



WEB COPY

petitioner to proceed further as per law. The respondent police is directed to serve the copy of the closure report to the petitioner at once.

11.08.2026

Internet : Yes/No

Index: Yes/No

rmi

TO

1. The Superintendent of Police,
Tirunelveli District.
2. The Inspector of Police,
Ambasamudram Police Station,
Tirunelveli District.



WEB COPY



DR. P. MURUGAN,J.

rmi

W.P.(MD) No.300 of 2024

11.08.2026