

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE A.M.SHAFIQUE
&
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.HARILAL**

FRIDAY, THE 26TH DAY OF DECEMBER 2014/5TH POUSHA, 1936

WP(C).No. 35261 of 2014 (G)

PETITIONER :

**MUHAMMED ALI, AGED 47 YEARS,
S/O.PULIKKAL MUHAMMED KUTTY, MANKARA,
ENGAKAD POST, THRISSUR DISTRICT, PIN: 680 589.**

BY ADV. SRI.P.BHASKARAN

RESPONDENTS :

- 1. SUB-INSPECTOR OF POLICE
WADAKANCHERY - 680 582, THRISSUR DISTRICT.**
- 2. MANAF, S/O.CHERUVAYIL PAREETH,
MANKARA DESHAM, ENGANKKAD, THALAPPILLI THALUK,
THRISSUR DISTRICT - 680001**
- 3. SULAIMAN,
S/O.CHEMBATHETHIL MOOSA MANKARA DESHAM,
ENGANKKADU, THALAPPILLI THALUK, THRISSUR DISTRICT.**

BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI. PADMARAJ

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 26-12-2014, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:**

bp

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S)' EXHIBITS

- EXT.P1: TRUE COPY OF O.S 1402/2014 DATED 8/12/2014.
- EXT.P2: TRUE COPY OF THE DOCUMENT NO.4116/99 BY WHICH 4.25 CENTS OF LANDED PROPERTIES WERE ASSIGNED IN FAVOR OF THE PETITIONER IS DATED 20/11/1999.
- EXT.P3: TRUE COPY OF THE LAND TAX FOR 2011-2012 FOR 0.0172 HECTOR IN SURVEY NO.350/12 OF ENGAKAD VILLAGE DATED 22/9/2011.
- EXT.P4: TRUE COPY OF THE LAND TAX FOR 2014-2015 FOR 0.0172 HECTOR IN SURVEY NO.350/12 OF ENGAKAD VILLAGE DATED 26/4/2014.
- EXT.P5: TRUE COPY OF THE POSSESSION CERTIFICATE IN RESPECT OF 0.0172 HECTOR OF LANDED PROPERTY DATED 28/11/2011.
- EXT.P6: TRUE COPY OF THE CERTIFICATE OF ENCUMBRANCE DATED 27/9/2011.

RESPONDENT(S)' EXHIBITS : NIL.

//TRUE COPY//

P.S. TO JUDGE

bp

A.M. Shaffique & K. Harilal, JJ.

=====

W.P (C) No. 35261 of 2014

=====

Dated this, the 26th day of December, 2014.

J U D G M E N T

Shaffique, J.

Petitioner has approached this Court alleging harassment by the police. According to him, he had certain civil dispute with party respondents 2 and 3. Civil suit is pending as O.S. No.1403/2014.

2. According to the petitioner, despite the pendency of the civil suit, the 1st respondent has unnecessarily summoned the petitioner, which amounts to harassment. The police is insisting that the petitioner should settle the matter pending before the civil court.

3. The learned Government Pleader, on instructions, submits that the police had summoned the petitioner on the basis of a complaint received from the party respondents 2 and 3. It was only to make enquiry that he was summoned to the police station. The police does not have any intention to interfere with the civil dispute between the parties.

4. Having regard to the aforesaid submission of the learned Government Pleader, it is clear that the police does not have any intention to interfere with the civil dispute between the petitioner and respondents 2 and 3 and therefore no case of police harassment is made out.

Hence, we close the writ petition taking on record the submission of the learned Government Pleader.

Sd/-

A.M. Shaffique, Judge.

Sd/-

K. Harilal, Judge.

Tds/