

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE THE AG.CHIEF JUSTICE MR.ASHOK BHUSHAN  
&  
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE A.M.SHAFIQUE

MONDAY, THE 19TH DAY OF JANUARY 2015/29TH POUSHA, 1936

WP(C).No. 1775 of 2015 (V)  
-----

PETITIONER :  
-----

ROY MATHEW,  
S/O.CHANDY MATHEW, KOLEDATH SANKARAMANGALATH HOUSE  
THATTAKKATTU MURI, KOIPURAM VILLAGE, THIRUVALLA TALUK  
PATHANAMTHITTA DISTRICT.

BY ADV. SRI.MVS.NAMBOOTHIRY

RESPONDENTS :  
-----

1. THE DISTRICT POLICE CHIEF  
PATHANAMTHITTA. 689 645.
2. THE DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE  
PATHANAMTHITTA. 689 645.
3. THE SUB INSPECTOR OF POLICE  
KOIPURAM POLICE STATION, KOIPURAM.689 531.
4. SAJI GEORGE CHERIAN  
S/O.M.C.CHERIAN, EDETTUMADOM, THATTAKKATTU MURI  
KOIPURAM VILLAGE, THIRUVALLA TALUK  
PATHANAMTHITTA DISTRICT. 689 531.

R1 TO R3 BY STATE ATTORNEY, SRI.P. VIJAYARAGHAVAN.

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON  
19-01-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

WP(C).No. 1775 of 2015 (V)  
-----

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS :  
-----

EXT.P1 - TRUE COPY OF THE COMPLAINT DATED 20.7.2013 FILED BY THE  
PETITIONER BEFORE THE 2ND RESPONDENT.

EXT.P2 - TRUE COPY OF THE COMPLAINT DATED 1.1.2015 SENT BY THE PETITIONER  
TO THE HON'BLE MINISTER FOR HOME AFFAIRS.

EXT.P3 - TRUE COPIES OF THE POSTAL RECEIPTS EVIDENCING REGISTRATION  
OF COMPLAINTS TO THE DIRECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE AND  
RESPONDENTS 1 TO 3.

RESPONDENTS' EXHIBITS :  
-----

NIL

/TRUE COPY/

PA TO JUDGE

**ASHOK BHUSHAN, Ag.C.J. & A.M. SHAFFIQUE, J.**

-----  
W.P.(C) No. 1775 OF 2015  
-----

Dated this the 19<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2015

**JUDGMENT**

**Ashok Bhushan, Ag.C.J.**

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned State Attorney. No notice is being issued to the 4<sup>th</sup> respondent in view of the order which is being passed.

2. By this writ petition the petitioner has prayed for a direction to respondents 1 to 3 to afford effective and meaningful protection to the life and property of the petitioner and his family members. The 4<sup>th</sup> respondent is the nephew of the petitioner, against whom the petitioner submitted complaints, Exts.P1 and P2. Learned State Attorney submits that on receiving the complaints, the 4<sup>th</sup> respondent was summoned to the police station and has already been warned.

3. In the facts of the present case we are of the view that the police authority shall keep a vigil on the issue between the petitioner and 4<sup>th</sup> respondent. We further observe that in the event if any offence is committed or there

is any attempt to commit offence, it is always open for the petitioner to file a complaint before the police authorities which shall be looked into and appropriate action shall be taken.

With the above observation, the Writ Petition is disposed of.

**Ashok Bhushan,  
Acting Chief Justice.**

**A.M. Shaffique,  
Judge.**