

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR.ASHOK BHUSHAN
&
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE A.M.SHAFFIQUE

WEDNESDAY, THE 27TH DAY OF MAY 2015/6TH JYAISHTA, 1937

WP(C).No. 14637 of 2015 (D)

PETITIONER :

SABEENA BEEVI
D/O.SUBAIA BEEGUM, MATTAPALLY, PURAVOORKONAM
VAZHAVILA, KARAKULAM, THIRUVANNATHAPURAM DIST

BY ADVS.SRI.S.MANIKANTAN NAIR
SRI.N.MANU THAMPI

RESPONDENTS :

1. STATE OF KERALA
REP BY SECRETARY, HOME DEPARTMENT
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 001.
2. DY.S.P.OF POLICE
NEDUMANGAD POLICE STATION,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 001.
3. ANIL KUMAR S V
SIVAKRIPA, BNRA 131, BHAGAVATHI NAGAR
NCC ROAD, AMBALAMUKKU,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 013.
4. DR SHEEBHA GEORGE
DREAMS, KORAVANKONAM, KOWDIAR P O
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 011.

R1 & R2 BY STATE ATTORNEY, SRI.P. VIJAYARAGHAVAN

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON
27-05-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

WP(C).No. 14637 of 2015 (D)

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS :

EXT P1:-PETITION TO DY S P NEDUMANGAD 2/6/2015.

EXT P1(A):-COPYO F TRANSLATION.

RESPONDENTS' EXHIBITS :

NIL

/TRUE COPY/

PA TO JUDGE

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

W.P.(C) No. 14637 OF 2015

Dated this the 27th day of May, 2015

JUDGMENT

Shaffique, J.

The petitioner has approached this Court seeking police protection. It is alleged that the petitioner had received Rs.10 lakhs from the 4th respondent for giving advance consideration for property to be purchased on behalf of the 4th respondent. An agreement of sale was also executed with one Abdul Rahman. It is alleged that, thereafter, the 4th respondent changed her mind and wants the money back. Demanding the said amount, the 4th respondent along with 3rd respondent has threatened the petitioner and the petitioner apprehends that they will cause danger to her life.

2. Learned State Attorney on instructions would submit that the issue between the petitioner and 4th respondent is with reference to money transaction and the 3rd respondent was only a mediator who requested the petitioner to return money to the 4th respondent. There is no law and order situation which gives rise to the interference by police.

Having regard to the aforesaid factual situation, we do not think that the petitioner is entitled to seek any order as prayed for. Police can interfere only when an offence is committed or there is any attempt to commit offence. Accordingly, the Writ Petition is dismissed.

**Ashok Bhushan,
Chief Justice.**

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