

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE THOTTATHIL B.RADHAKRISHNAN

&

THE HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE ANU SIVARAMAN

WEDNESDAY, THE 11TH DAY OF NOVEMBER 2015/20TH KARTHIKA, 1937

WP(C).No. 33858 of 2015 (F)

PETITIONER:

ABDUL NAZAR AGED 45 YEARS
S/O.YAHOOTTY, THAIVALAPPIL HOUSE, CHAMRAVATTOM PO
TIRUR TALUK, MALAPPURAM DISTRICT

BY ADV. SRI.C.M.MOHAMMED IQUABAL

RESPONDENTS:

1. THE DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE
MALAPPURAM
OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE
MALAPPURAM DISTRICT, PIN 676505
2. THE CIRCLE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
TIRUR POLICE STATION, POST TIRUR, MALAPPURAM DISTRICT
PIN 676101
3. THE SUB INSPECTOR OF POLICE
TIRUR POLICE STATION, POST TIRUR, MALAPPURAM DISTRICT
PIN 676101
4. MR. KUNJUMOIDEEN
S/O.CHEKKUTTY, MAMBRAKKAL HOUSE, CHAMRAVATTOM PO
TIRUR TALUK, MALAPPURAM DISTRICT, PIN 676110

BY SENIOR GOVERNMENT PLEADER C.R.SYAM KUMAR

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

WP(C).No. 33858 of 2015 (F)

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS

- P1: THE TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER BEFORE THE DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE, TIRUR DATED 03.07.2015 WITH ITS ENGLSIH TRANSLATION.
- P2: TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENATATION SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER BEFORE THE 1ST RESPONDENT DATED 28.07.2015 WITH ITS ENGLISH TRANSLATION.
- P3: TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER BEFORE THE 1ST RESPONDENT DATED 31.10.2015.

RESPONDENTS' EXHIBITS: NIL

TRUE COPY

P.A.TO JUDGE

THOTTATHIL B.RADHAKRISHNAN &
ANU SIVARAMAN, JJ.

=====

W.P.(C).No.33858 of 2015

=====

Dated this the 11th day of November, 2015

JUDGMENT

Thottathil B.Radhakrishnan, J.

1.After hearing the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Senior Government Pleader, what we see is that the matter is entirely relatable to disputes which could go before the civil jurisdiction as between the petitioner and the fourth respondent. The petitioner alleges that the fourth respondent is an unauthorised money lender and a loan shark, while the fourth respondent alleges that the petitioner had dues in a transaction on immovable property.

2.The learned Senior Government Pleader submits, on instructions, that the petitioner was called to the Police Station in connection with a complaint filed by the fourth respondent and his statement was recorded. When it was disclosed that

the matter was essentially in the civil domain, the complaint was closed. He also states that the police had raided the premises of the fourth respondent and could not find out any indicator to generate criminal proceedings on the ground of unauthorised money lending.

3. Under the aforesaid circumstances, we do not find any ground to issue any direction as sought for. The writ petition, therefore, fails.

In the result, this writ petition is dismissed.

sd/-

Thottathil B.Radhakrishnan, Judge

sd/-

Anu Sivaraman, Judge

sj

TRUE COPY

P.A.TO JUDGE