

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 03.10.2018

C O R A M
THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE K.KALYANASUNDARAM

W.P.No.4861 of 2011

Pounraj

... Petitioner

Vs

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

2.The Inspector of Police,
Andimadam Police Station,
Ariyalur District.

...Respondents

Prayer: Petition filed under article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying to issue a Writ of Mandamus to direct the 2nd respondent herein to give police protection to the petitioner at his cost for the periods to be specified by this Court pursuant to the representation dated 25.01.2011 given by the petitioner.

For Petitioner : M/s.T.Muruganathan

For Respondents : Mr.B.Anand, G.A.

O R D E R

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, learned Government Advocate for the respondents and perused the materials available on record.

2. This Writ Petition has been filed for issuance of a direction to the second respondent herein to give police protection to the petitioner at his cost for the periods specified by this Court, based on his representation dated 25.01.2011.

3. The petitioner would state that he has purchased 86 cents of land from one Kaliaperumal, by a registered sale deed, dated 20.02.2004. The mutation in the Revenue Records has been taken place and he has been in continuous possession and enjoyment of

the property. The petitioner would allege that one Ramaiyan, Chokalingam and Kannaiyan, sons of Subramaniam claiming right over the property had started interfering with his possession and also took steps to change the Revenue Records and hence, he filed W.P.No.16995 of 2007 and got interim order in W.M.P.No.1 of 2017.

4. The further case of the petitioner is that the persons stated above by creating forged records approached the Civil Court by filing suits in O.S.Nos.377 of 2004 and 59 of 2007 on the file of the District Munsif Court, Jeyagondam, but they were not able to get interim order. When the petitioner attempted to cut the trees grown in his land, life threat came from the opposite parties and hence, he gave a representation on 25.01.2011 seeking police protection. Since no order has been passed, the present Writ Petition has been filed.

5. The learned Government Advocate would submit that this Writ Petition has been filed based on the representation of the petitioner dated 25.01.2011 and if the petitioner is still having any threat from the opposite parties and if a fresh representation is given, it would be considered in accordance with law.

6. Considering the above facts and submissions made by the learned Government Advocate, this Writ Petition is disposed of, permitting the petitioner to give a fresh representation to the respondents, if so warranted. On such representation, the respondents shall consider the same in accordance with law.

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

Sd/-
Deputy Registrar

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

pvs

To

1. The Superintendent of Police,
Ariyalur District, Ariyalur.
2. The Inspector of Police,
Andimadam Police Station,
Ariyalur District.

WEB COPY

3. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

+lcc to Mr.T.Muruganantham, Advocate, S.R.No.68355

W.P.No.4861 of 2011

rrs 24/10/2018



WEB COPY