

**BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT**

DATED : 05.01.2016

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S. VAIDYANATHAN**Cr1.O.P. (MD) No. 24395 of 2015**

K.S.Mathivanan

... Petitioner

-Vs-

1.The Superintendent of Police,
Theni District, Theni.

2.The Inspector of Police,
Chinnamanur Police Station,
Theni District.

3.K.G.Sivasubramanian

4.A.Muthuraja

5.P.Alagu @ Algurajan

6.S.Mahendran

7.S.Paramasivam

8.M.Nagaraj

9.M.Chellapandi

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, praying to direct the respondents to give adequate police protection to the petitioner to do his cable T.V. Operation, based on his representation dated 29.03.2014, 12.01.2015 and 22.01.2015.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Muthu Vijayapandian


For Respondents : Mrs.S.Prabha

(R1 and R2) Govt.Advocate (Cr1.side)

O R D E R

The petitioner has come forward with this application, praying to direct the respondent police to give adequate police protection to the petitioner to do his cable T.V. Operation, based on his representation dated 29.03.2014, 12.01.2015 and 22.01.2015.

2. Mr.P.Muthu Vijayapandian, counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is the one of the respondent in the Writ Petition Nos.1805, 2902 and 2178 of 2012, wherein the 3rd respondent was the petitioner in those cases. This Court while permitting the writ petitioner to operate the cable



TV has observed that "the order of injunction, dated 10.04.2013, will not prevent the respondents 4 to 14, from operating the local cable TV operation legally". He would further submit that the 3rd respondent herein/writ petitioner is harassing the petitioner and also interfering and creating trouble to the petitioner in operating the cable TV and therefore, the petitioner has given representations to the respondent police, but, till date, the same has not been considered. Therefore, the petitioner has come before this Court with this petition, for the relief stated supra.

3. Mrs.S.Prabha, Government Advocate (crl.side) appearing for the respondent police would submit that there is no complaint received by the Police and that if there are any law and order problem, certainly, the police would interfere. As there is no complaint received by them, no action has been initiated and the request made by the petitioner is highly premature

4. Taking note of the submission made by the Government Advocate (crl.side) that the respondent police have not received any complaint from the petitioner, I find no reason to grant the relief sought for by the petitioner. However, If there are any untoward incidents or law and order problem, the police would interfere.

5. With the above observation, the Criminal Original Petition is disposed of.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(CO)

/True copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

MPK

To

1.The Superintendent of Police, Theni District, Theni.

2.The Inspector of Police,
Chinnamanur Police Station, Theni District.

3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.

+1cc to Mr.P.Muthu Vijayapandian,Advocate SR No.426

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.24395 of 2015
05.01.2016

rg.GSV-AN/SAR-II 11.01.2016 2P/5C