

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 09.10.2018

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.KALYANASUNDARAM

W.P. No.5745 of 2011

C.Singaravel

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Secretary to Government, (Home),
The Secretariat,
Chennai - 9.

2.The Collector of Cuddalore District,
Cuddalore.

3.The Superintendent of Police,
Cuddalore District,
Cuddalore.

4.J.Selvaraji

5.J.Sundararaj

6.J.Soundararaj

7.J.Senthil

8.J.Dakshinamurthy

.... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a Writ of Mandamus to direct the respondents 1 to 3 to take suitable action against respondents 4 to 8 and to ensure that the petitioner and his family members are not isolated from the Villagers of Thazhanchavadi Village, Cuddalore Taluk, Cuddalore District.

For Petitioner : Mr.D.Baskar

For Respondents : Mr.B.Anand

Government Advocate for R1 to R3

No appearance for R4 to R8

O R D E R

Heard Mr.D.Baskar, learned counsel for the petitioner; Mr.B.Anand, learned Government Advocate for the respondents 1 and 3 and perused the materials available on record. Despite

service of notice and the name of the respondents 4 to 8 have printed in the cause list, none appeared for them.

2. This writ petition has been filed seeking direction to the respondents 1 to 3 to take suitable action against the private respondents 4 to 8.

3. It is the case of the petitioner that when he was fencing lines, a dispute arose between him and his neighbours viz., Murugan and Ponmudi, for which, a criminal case was registered against the petitioner and thereafter, the private respondents have convened the meeting on 20.01.2011 and instructed the public not to attend the marriage to be held for the petitioner's brother.

4. The grievance of the petitioner is that despite his representations to the Official respondents dated 24.01.2011 and 07.02.2011, no action was taken against the private respondents.

5. The learned Government Advocate by relying upon the counter filed by the third respondent would argue that in an enquiry conducted based on the petitioner's representations, though the petitioner has not participated, it came to light that there was a financial transaction between the petitioner and the private respondents and the allegations in the complaint are false.

6. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that without any intimation or notice to the petitioner, an enquiry said to have been conducted by the Official respondents and if the petitioner is having any grievance, he is ready to give a fresh representation and that may be considered in accordance with law.

7. I have carefully gone through the representations of the petitioner and the averments made in the affidavit.

8. In the light of the above grievance expressed by the petitioner and submissions of the learned counsel on the either side, this Court, without going into the merits of the case, permits the petitioner to give a fresh representation to the Official respondents, if he is having any grievance and if any representation is given, the respondents shall take appropriate action on merits and in accordance with law, after providing opportunity to all necessary parties.

9. With the above observation, the Writ Petition is disposed of. There is no order as to costs.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CS IV)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

r n s

To

- 1.The Secretary to Government, (Home),
The Secretariat,
Chennai - 9.
- 2.The Collector of Cuddalore District,
Cuddalore.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Cuddalore District,
Cuddalore.

+1cc to Mr.D.Baskar, Advocate Sr.69726
+1cc to the Government Pleader Sr.70139

W.P. No.5745 of 2011

skv[co]
srg 31/10/2018

WEB COPY