

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

**THE HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR.ASHOK BHUSHAN
&**

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE A.M.SHAFFIQUE

MONDAY, THE 23RD DAY OF NOVEMBER 2015/2ND AGRAHAYANA, 1937

WP(C).No. 35306 of 2015 (K)

PETITIONER(S):

**PRASAD V.S.NAIR, S/O.VELAPPAN NAIR,
SITE BUILDERS, EVRAC-53, VETTAMUKKU,
ELIPODE ROAD, THIRUMALA,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM DISTRICT.**

BY ADV. SRI.LATHEESH SEBASTIAN.

RESPONDENT(S):

- 1. THE DIRECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE,
POLICE HEADQUARTERS, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695 001.**
- 2. THE COMMISSIONER OF POLICE,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695 001.**
- 3. THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF POLICE,
CANTONMENT POLICE STATION,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.**
- 4. THE SUB INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
VATTIYOORKAVU POLICE STATION,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.**
- 5. THE SUB INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
POOJAPPURA POLICE STATION,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.**
- 6. ALWIN THOMAS, APARTMENT NO.9B,
SREEDHANYA, SREEKARYAM,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695 011.**

R1 TO R5 BY SRI.P. VIJAYARAGHAVAN, STATE ATTORNEY.

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 23-11-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:**

rs.

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS:-

- EXT.P1 COPY OF THE COMPLAINT OF THE PETITIONER DATED 30/09/2015
BEFORE THE LEGAL SERVICE AUTHORITY, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.
- EXT.P2 COPY OF THE ORDER OF THE SESSIONS COURT,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM IN CRL.MC. NO.2332/2015 DATED 30/10/2015.
- EXT.P3 COPY OF THE ORDER OF THE SESSIONS COURT,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM IN CRL.MC. NO.2393/2015 DATED 09/11/2015.
- EXT.P4 COPY OF THE COMPLAINT OF PETITIONER'S FAMILY TO THE
1ST RESPONDENT DATED 26/10/2015.

RESPONDENT'S EXHIBITS:- NIL.

//TRUE COPY//

P.S. TO JUDGE

rs.

ASHOK BHUSHAN, CJ

&

A.M.SHAFFIQUE, J.

*** * * * ***

W.P.C.No.35306 of 2015

Dated this the 23rd day of November 2015

J U D G M E N T

Ashok Bhushan, CJ

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned State Attorney. No notice is being issued to the 6th respondent in view of the judgment being passed today.

2. This writ petition has been filed by the petitioner alleging police harassment. It is submitted that the petitioner is a building contractor and there is a civil dispute with the 6th respondent regarding construction work. According to the petitioner, he is being summoned by the police authorities, which is nothing but harassment.

3. The learned State Attorney, on instructions, would submit that a complaint was received from the mother of the 6th respondent, with regard to which, petitioner and the complainant were summoned. The complainant appeared and produced an agreement. Police authorities having come to know that the

dispute is pertaining to the contract, had closed the complaint on 26/10/2015.

The complaint, having already been closed, we see no reason to issue any direction, as prayed for. This writ petition is closed.

(sd/-)
(ASHOK BHUSHAN, CHIEF JUSTICE)
(sd/-)
(A.M.SHAFFIQUE, JUDGE)

True Copy

PA to Judge

jsr/23/11/2015