

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A. RAMALINGESWARA RAO

WRIT PETITION NO. 4624 OF 2017

ORDER:

This Writ Petition was filed challenging the inaction of the respondents 1 to 5 pursuant to the registration of Crime No. 229 of 2015 by the Central Crime Station, Detective Department, Hyderabad.

Now a counter affidavit is filed by the 4th respondent stating as follows:

“The respondent No. 4 contacted the petitioner/complainant several times and requested him to produce witnesses as well as the clarification about the civil cases filed by him. But, the petitioner/complainant failed to appear before the respondent No. 4 and co-operate the investigation. The petitioner himself told that he was busy in his job and unable to appear to clarify the information relating to civil cases which he was filed and dismissed.

In this case the complainant/petitioner did not produce any witness or relevant documentary evidence in support of his complaint to prove prima facie against the alleged respondent company. Prior to filing this complaint, the complainant/petitioner had approached to the Ranga Reddy District Legal Services Authority as well as the Hon'ble Court of Chief Judge, City Civil Court, Hyderabad and filed similar petitions against the respondent company. All the civil petitions filed by the complainant got dismissed in the Court of Hon'ble Chief Judge, CCC, Hyderabad. As the all attempts failed in Civil Court, the complainant/petitioner had filed complaint against Transstroy (India) Limited in order to harass the respondent company. As the civil dispute in between the complainant/petitioner and the alleged respondent with regard to the contract works and its claims, the contents of the complaint is comes under the purview of Civil in Nature. Taking the prior permission from the superior officers, respondent No. 4 referred the case as Civil in Nature by submitting Final Report on 12.7.2016 before the Hon'ble XII Additional CMM Court, Hyderabad and the same intimated through Notice to the complainant by post, but the same is returned with un-claimed.”

In view of the above, no further orders are necessary in this Writ Petition and accordingly, the Writ Petition is closed. However, it is open to the petitioner to take appropriate legal procedure in accordance with law. There

shall be no order as to costs. As a sequel thereto, miscellaneous petitions, pending if any, shall stand closed.

A. RAMALINGESWARA RAO, J

DATE: 07.03.2017

KA

