



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 09.01.2018

CORAM

WEB COPY

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.RAJAMANICKAM

Crl.O.P. (MD) No.17221 of 2017

1.S.Ranjith

2.V.Satheesh Kumar

...Petitioners

Vs.

State Represented through,

1.The Superintendant of Police,
Dindigul District,
Dindigul.

2.The Sub-Inspector of Police,
Viru Veedu Police Station,
Viruvedu,
Batlagundu,
Dindigul District.

3.The Sub-Inspector of Police,
Saptur Police Station,
Madurai District.

...Respondents

PRAYER: Criminal Original petition filed under Section 482 of Code of Criminal Procedure, directing the second respondent not to harass these petitioners under the guise of booking them under false cases.

For Petitioners	: Mr.J.William Christopher
For Respondents	: Mr.A.P.G.Ohm Chairma Prabhu Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

O R D E R

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed to direct the second respondent not to harass the petitioners under the guise of enquiry.

2.The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the first petitioner is working as Regional Manager in Muthoot Housing Finance Co., Ltd. and the second petitioner is working as Manager in ADR Gold Loan Firm, Batlagundu. The said ADR Gold Loan Firm is running by the cousin of the first petitioner. He further



submitted that one accused by name Puli Ramaraj involved in theft case and gave a confession, stating that he has pledged the Gold with the first petitioner and in pursuance of the said confession the third respondent came to the finance company and enquired the first petitioner about the said pledge of gold and at the time, the first petitioner asked the identity of the third respondent, but without disclosing his identity, the third respondent assaulted the petitioner and arrested him and handed over to the second respondent and also gave a false complaint. Thereafter, the first petitioner released on bail. He further submitted that under the guise of filing false case, the second respondent is threatening the petitioners and hence, they have filed the present petition to issue a suitable direction to the second respondent.

3.The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondents has submitted that based on the complaint, given by the third respondent, a case was registered against the first petitioner in Cr.No.139 of 2017 for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 341, 294(b), 353 and 506(ii) of IPC and in the above case he was arrested and produced before the Magistrate concerned and subsequently, he was released on bail. He further submitted that the second respondent has not threatened the petitioners. He further submitted that the investigation is almost completed in Cr.No.139 of 2017 and a final report will be filed shortly and hence, the question of harassing the petitioners does not arise.

4.Recording the aforesaid submission, the criminal original petition is disposed of and if the appearance of the petitioners is required for an investigation, the second respondent can call them by issuing summons and on such appearance, the petitioners should not be harassed.

5.With the aforesaid observation, this Criminal Original Petition is disposed of.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(CS-II)

/True copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar

To

1.The Superintendant of Police,
Dindigul District, Dindigul.

2.The Sub-Inspector of Police,
Viru Veedu Police Station,
Batlagundu,
Dindigul District.



3.The Sub-Inspector of Police,
Saptur Police Station,
Madurai District.

4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.

CrI.O.P. (MD) No.17221 of 2017
09.01.2018

mm

KK/MR/SAR 1/25.01.2018/ 3P- 5C/