



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 22.06.2016

CORAM

THE HON'BLE DR.JUSTICE S.VIMALA

W.P(MD)No.10921 of 2016

and

W.M.P.(MD).No.8463 of 2016

WEB COPY

Karuppu @ Kamalkaruppu

... Petitioner

-Vs-

1.The Commissioner of Police,
Madurai City,
Madurai.

2.The Inspector of Police,
Subramaniapuram Police Station,
Madurai.

3.Malaichamy

... Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ of Mandamus, directing the first respondent to consider the petitioner's representation dated 15.06.2016 preferred against the respondents 2 and 3, harassing the petitioner in conducting the family function to be held on 26.06.2016 at N.M.R. Marriage Hall, T.P.K. Road, Madurai.


For Petitioner	:	Mr.V.P.Rajan
For Respondents	:	Mr.D.Muruganandam,
1 and 2		Addl. Govt. Pleader.

O R D E R

The writ petition has been filed seeking for a direction to the respondents 2 and 3 not to interfere with the private family function of the petitioner i.e., ear-boring ceremony of the petitioner's son by name Rakshan, to be held on 26.06.2016, at N.M.R. Marriage Hall, T.P.K. Road, Madurai.

2.Mr.D.Muruganandam, learned Additional Government Pleader, takes notice for the respondents 1 and 2. By consent, the writ petition is taken up for final disposal at the stage of admission itself. In view of the nature of the relief sought for, this Court is of the view that notice need not be sent to the third respondent.

3. Heard, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned Additional Government Pleader appearing for the respondents.



4.The petitioner's wife had earlier made a representation dated 20.02.2015 seeking Police Protection for the life and limb of her family including her husband. It is stated by the petitioner that the petitioner and his family members are prevented by the respondents 2 and 3 from performing ear-boring ceremony of petitioner's son at the place scheduled.

5.The learned Additional Public Prosecutor, on instructions, would submit that the Office of the Commissioner of Police, Madurai City have issued an instruction to the Inspector of Police to take note of the possibility of the revenge attack / murder between two groups, which may hurt the petitioner's family. As there is a possibility of revenge attack, the respondents Police advised the petitioner not to conduct the function.

6.According to the learned Additional Public Prosecutor, it was purely advisory in nature and It was communicated only in the interest of the welfare of the petitioner's family and the petitioner and his family members are not prevented by the respondents Police from performing such function.

7. Recording the above statement made by the learned Additional Government Pleader, this writ petition is closed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is also closed.

Sd/
Assistant Registrar(AE)

/True Copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar.

To

1.The Commissioner of Police,
Madurai City,
Madurai.

2.The Inspector of Police,
Subramaniapuram Police Station,
Madurai.

+1CC to M/S.V.P.Rajan, Advocate, SR.No. 32086
+1CC to the Special Government Pleader, SR.No. 32071

ORDER MADE IN
W.P(MD)No.10921 of 2016
and
W.M.P. (MD) .No.8463 of 2016
22.06.2016

gcg
AM/GSV.PM/SAR-III/23.06.2016/2P/5C