

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 13.04.2015

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.N.PRAKASH

Cr1.O.P.No.8219 of 2015

Lotte India Corporation Limited
Rep by its S.Ravi Shankar (Authorised Signatory)
Nellikuppam
Cuddalore D.T.

...Petitioner

vs.

1.State by
Inspector of Police
Nellikuppam Police Station
Cuddalore D.T.

2.Lotte India Corporation Mittai Alai
Thozhilalargal Sangam
Rep by its Secretary - Kandasamy
Nellikuppam
Cuddalore D.T.

...Respondents

Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. to issue direction to the first respondent to act on the complaint of the petitioner dated 27.03.2015 and provide adequate police protection to maintain law and order in and around the factory premises of the petitioner and prevent the members of the second respondent union from preventing the willing workmen, contract workmen official staffs from attending work and also provide adequate police protection to petitioner for smooth ingress and egress of workmen and materials to the petitioner's factory premises situated at Nellikuppam, Cuddalore D.T. and pass such further orders.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Ravindran

For Respondent : Mr.C.Emalias, APP

O R D E R

This petition has been filed seeking direction to the first respondent to act on the complaint of the petitioner dated 27.03.2015 and provide adequate police protection to maintain law

and order in and around the factory premises of the petitioner.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the State.

3. It is submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that on account of problem created by the Labour Union, there was a law and order problem in the factory and the petitioner approached the respondent police and lodged a complaint on 27.03.2015 which was taken on file as CSR No.82 of 2015. It is admitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that pursuant to the complaint in CSR No.82 of 2015, police protection was given to the Company on the same day. The learned counsel further submits that, on subsequent dates when the petitioner approached the respondent police, they refused to give police protection.

4. Taking into consideration the fact that there appears to be some unrest in the Company of the petitioner, the respondent police is directed to afford police protection to maintain law and order in and around the petitioner's Company as and when there is likelihood of breach of peace, on the complaint given by the petitioner.

With the above observation this petition is closed.

Sd/-
Deputy Registrar(J)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

gms

To

1.Inspector of Police,
Nellikuppam Police Station,
Cuddalore D.T.

2.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

1 CC to Mr.S.Ravindran, Advocate SR.No. 20377

Cr1.O.P.No.8219 of 2015

RJ (CO)
PSI (29.04.2015)