

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

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

TUESDAY, THE 3RD DAY OF NOVEMBER 2015/12TH KARTHIKA, 1937

WP(C).No. 33344 of 2015 (P)

PETITIONER:

**CLEETUS @ KUNJUMON, AGED 52,
PALLIVILA VEEDU, KODUVILA.P.O.,
EAST KALLADA, KOLLAM DISTRICT, PIN - 691 502.**

BY ADV. SRI.JOSEPH SEBASTIAN (KOLLAM)

RESPONDENT(S):

- 1. SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE (RURAL),
ERNAKULAM (ALUVA) RURAL S.P.OFFICE,
ALUVA, ERNAKULAM DISTRICT - 682 016.**
- 2. CIRCLE INSPECTOR OF POLICE, N.PARAVOOR,
ERNAKULAM DISTRICT - 682 010.**
- 3. SUB-INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
VARAPUZHA POLICE STATION,
ERNAKULAM DISTRICT.**
- 4. SHAJI, AGED 50, S/O.ISAC, KUNNATHU VEEDU,
ONAMBALAM, KUMBALAM.P.O.,
KOLLAM DISTRICT, PIN - 691 503.**
- 5. JEROME, AGED 40, S/O.JAMES,
PANAVILA PUTHEN VEEDU, KODUVILA.P.O.,
EAST KALLADA, KOLLAM DISTRICT, PIN - 691 502.**

R1 TO R3 BY STATE ATTORNEY SRI.P.VIJAYARAGHAVAN

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 03-11-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:**

mbr/

APPENDIX

PETITIONERS' EXHIBITS:

EXT. P1 : TRUE COPY OF THE AGREEMENT DATED 25.1.2015 EXECUTED
BETWEEN THE PETITIONER AND 5TH RESPONDENT MR.JEROME
ALONG WITH ITS TRUE ENGLISH TRANSLATION.

EXT. P2 : TRUE COPY OF THE COMPLAINT LODGED BY THE PETITIONER
AGAINST 2ND RESPONDENT, CIRCLE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
PARAVOOR ALONG WITH ITS TRUE ENGLISH TRANSLATION.

RESPONDENTS' EXHIBITS: NIL.

//TRUE COPY//

P.S. TO JUDGE

mbr/

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

W.P.(C)No.33344 of 2015

Dated this the 3rd day of November, 2015.

J U D G M E N T

SHAFFIQUE, J.

The petitioner has approached this Court alleging police harassment. It is stated that he is the owner of a country-boat meant for fishing, which was stolen and later it was found out. Though the police had given back the country-boat, later, on the basis of a complaint given by the 4th respondent, the petitioner is being implicated in non bailable offences and he is un-necessarily being summoned to the police station.

2. The learned State Attorney on instruction would submit that, initially, though a claim was made by the petitioner in respect of a country-boat, after conducting enquiry, it was given to him and the 4th respondent has filed a complaint before the State Police Chief, which was sent for enquiry to the Circle Inspector and during enquiry, the

C.I. had summoned the petitioner as well. The petitioner appeared through counsel. The enquiry was completed and it was found that the complaint given by the 4th respondent has no basis and accordingly the matter was closed.

3. The facts being so, we do not think that the allegation raised by the petitioner amounts to harassment by the police. The police had summoned the petitioner only for the purpose of enquiring into the complaint given by the 4th respondent and that too, he appeared through his counsel. Under such circumstance, the petitioner is not entitled for any of the direction sought for.

Hence we close this petition.

Sd/-
ASHOK BHUSHAN,
CHIEF JUSTICE.

Sd/-
A.M.SHAFFIQUE,
JUDGE.

ami/

//True copy//

P.A. to Judge