

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR.ASHOK BHUSHAN
&

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE A.M.SHAFFIQUE

FRIDAY, THE 17TH DAY OF JULY 2015/26TH ASHADHA, 1937

WP(C).No. 21686 of 2015 (I)

PETITIONER(S) :-

P.J.ALEXANDER
S/O.JOSEPH, PUTHUVELIL VEEDU, PAYIPPADU MURI
PAYIPPADU VILLAGE, CHANGANACHERRY TALUK.

BY ADVS.SRI.K.SHAJ
SRI.SAJJU.S

RESPONDENT(S) :-

1. THE SUB INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
THRIKKODITHANAM POLICE STATION, PIN - 686 112.
2. LAWRENCE JOHN
S/O.JOHN, SNEHATHEERAM VEEDU, PAYIPPADU MURI
PAYIPPADU VILLAGE, CHANGANACHERRY TALUK-686 101.

R1 BY STATE ATTORNEY SRI.P.VIJAYARAGHAVAN

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 17-07-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:

jvt

WP(C).No. 21686 of 2015 (I)

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S) ' EXHIBITS :-

EXT.P1- THE TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION DATED 17.06.2015
FILED BY THE PETITIONER.

EXT.P2- TRUE COPY OF THE ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF EXHIBIT P1
REPRESENTATION.

EXT.P3-TRUE COPY OF THE RECEIPT OF EXHIBIT P1 PETITION ISSUED
FROM THE OFFICE OF THE FIRST RESPONDENT DT.14.6.2015.

EXT.P4-TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT OF THIS HONOURABLE COURT DATED
15.06.2015 IN WP(C)16680 OF 2015.

RESPONDENT(S) ' EXHIBITS :- NIL

//TRUE COPY//

P.A. TO JUDGE

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

W.P.(C) No.21686 of 2015

Dated this the 17th day of July 2015

J U D G M E N T

Shaffique, J

The petitioner has approached this Court seeking for police protection inter alia contending that the 2nd respondent, who had close acquaintance with the petitioner, has threatened the petitioner that he will not be permitted to proceed with the construction of the building. Further, it is contended that there was a financial transaction on account of an agreement relating to sale of property, for which, the petitioner has filed a suit, which has irritated the 2nd respondent and he has threatened the petitioner with loss of life. The petitioner had filed a complaint before the police and since, no action has been taken in the matter, the petitioner has approached this Court.

2. Learned State Attorney on instructions would submit that there is no specific allegation made out by the petitioner to seek police protection. No untoward incident has been reported also.

3. Having heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and after having perused the records, we do not find that there was

-: 2 :-

any incident, for which, police protection can be ordered. The police can interfere only if any offence is committed or there is attempt to commit offence. Though the petitioner submits that there was threat that the construction of the building will be stopped, no such incident has been reported also.

4. Under such circumstances, the petitioner is not entitled for any order as prayed for in this writ petition. However, we only observe that if any offence is committed or there is attempt to commit offence or there is any illegal obstruction by the 2nd respondent in the matter relating to construction of building, on the complaint of the petitioner, the police shall look into the matter and do the needful.

With the above observation, this writ petition is closed.

Sd/-
ASHOK BHUSHAN
CHIEF JUSTICE

Sd/-
A.M. SHAFFIQUE
JUDGE