



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 29.11.2017

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE **S.S.SUNDAR**

W.P. (MD) No.16763 of 2017

Srimathi

... Petitioner

Vs.

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

2. The Inspector of Police,
Srivaikundam Police Station,
Srivaikundam,
Tuticorin District.

3.Ramar

4.Lakshmi

... Respondents

[R3 and 4 are impleaded vide Court order dated 12.10.2017 in W.M.P. (MD) No.13672 of 2017]

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for the issuance of a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents to provide necessary police protection for life and limb of the petitioner and his family members based on the representation given by the petitioner on 29.08.2017.

For Petitioner	: Mr.N.Madhava Govindan
For Respondents	: Mr.R.Karthikeyan
1 and 2	Additional Government Pleader
For Respondents	: Mr.A.Anandan
3 and 4	

O R D E R

This Writ Petition is filed for issuing a direction to the respondents to provide necessary police protection for the life and limb of the petitioner and his family members.

<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/>
2. The petitioner states that she is having 13 acres of land purchased with the funds sent by his son who is working at



Singapore. In the agricultural land, it is stated by the petitioner that she has grown coconut trees, goats and having pumpsets for drawing water to the plants. It is further stated that the petitioner has employed one Raman / the third respondent as labour and later stopped him from engaging as he was not properly working. However, when the petitioner was trying to sell the goats the third respondent gave some trouble and did not permit the petitioner to sell the goats. The third respondent stated to have threatened the petitioner on 27.08.2017 and trying to assault the petitioner. It is further stated that despite a complaint was lodged as against the third respondent and his associates, for specific overt acts, it is stated that the police did not take any action. It is also stated that the third respondent and his wife made an attempt to the life of the petitioner with the help of one Sivaraman who is also one of the relatives of the fourth respondent. It is in these circumstances, the petitioner has given a representation to the respondents 1 and 2.

3.Originally, the Writ Petition was filed without impleading respondents 3 and 4. Since the petitioner claimed ownership over the properties in order to ascertain whether the persons against whom the petitioner has made allegations has got any interest or claim in respect of the properties of the petitioner and to know about the nature of dispute between the petitioner and the respondents 3 and 4, this Court directed the petitioner to implead the respondents 3 and 4. Accordingly, the respondents 3 and 4 were impleaded and they were represented by a counsel. Today when the matter is specifically posted for hearing, there was no representation for respondents 3 and 4.

4.The learned Additional Government Pleader appearing for the respondents 1 and 2 filed a status report admitting the averments that were made in support of this Writ Petition.

5.Having regard to the peculiar facts, this Court is inclined to pass the following order:

"The second respondent is directed to consider the representation of the petitioner dated 29.08.2017 and provide adequate police protection to the extend possible and as required for the petitioner."

6.With the above direction, this Writ Petition is disposed of. No costs.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(CO)

/True Copy/



To

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

2. The Inspector of Police,
Srivaikundam Police Station,
Srivaikundam,
Tuticorin District.

+ 1 cc TO Mr.N.Madhava Govindan , Advocate in SR No. 90350

SRM

AE/SV MMS/SAR4/18.12.2017/3P/4C

W.P. (MD) No.16763 of 2017
29.11.2017