



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 28.02.2018

CORAM

WEB COPY

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAMW.P.(MD).No.345 of 2013

A.Jeyaseelan

.. Petitioner

Vs.

- 1.The Director General of Police,
Tamil Nadu Police Department,
Beach Road, Chennai.
- 2.The Deputy Inspector General of Police,
Tirunelveli Zone, Maharaja Nagar,
Tirunelveli.
- 3.The Deputy Inspector General of Police,
Ramanathapuram Zone,
Rmanathapuram.
- 4.The Superintendent of Police,
Tuticorin District, Tuticorin.
- 5.The Additional Superintendent of Police,
Tuticorin District, Tuticorin.
- 6.Jeevarathinam
Sub Inspector of Police,
Kenikarai Police Station,
Ramanathapuram.
- 7.Sudalaimani,
Head Constable-2121,
Kulathur Police Station,
Tuticorin District.

.. Respondents

PRAYER: Writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondent No.1 to take stringent action against the respondents No-6 and 7 by considering the petitioner's representation dated 19.11.2012 in the light of the report of the respondent No.6.

For Petitioners

: Mr.S.M.A.Jinnah

For R1 to R5

: Mr.R.Sethuraman

For R6

: Mr.M.Subashbabu

**ORDER**

The brother of the sixth respondent is the writ petitioner in the present writ petition. The relief sought for in this writ petition is for a direction to direct the respondents to take stringent action against the respondents 6 and 7.

2.The very filing of the writ petition shows that the writ petitioner is having certain personal enmity with the sixth respondent, who is none other than his own brother. Any how this Court is of an opinion that if any complaint is received against the public servant by any person, the same has to be enquired into by the competent authority. The writ petitioner can be treated as informer in respect of the misconduct, if any, committed by the sixth respondent. In such view of the matter, this Court directed the learned Special Government Pleader to get instructions.

3.Today, the learned Special Government Pleader, on instructions, informed to this Court that action was taken against the complaint submitted by the petitioner. In fact punishment was also imposed by the competent authorities against the sixth respondent.

4.This being the factum of the case, no further relief can be granted. It is for the competent authority to initiate any further action in accordance with the rules based on the facts and circumstances of the case. In other words, the writ petitioner, being the brother of the sixth respondent, may not have locus standi to interfere with the relationship of an employer and employee and as an informer he had given a complaint, that was taken note of by the authorities and action was also initiated.

5.This being the factum no further adjudication is required in this matter. Accordingly, this writ petition stands dismissed. However, no order as to costs.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar (CS-II)

/True copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar

To

1.The Director General of Police,
Tamil Nadu Police Department,
Beach Road, Chennai.

2.The Deputy Inspector General of Police,
<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/>
Tirunelveli Zone, Maharaja Nagar,
Tirunelveli.



3.The Deputy Inspector General of Police,
Ramanathapuram Zone,
Ramanathapuram.

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

5.The Additional Superintendent of Police,
Tuticorin District, Tuticorin.

+1CC TO M/S.M.SUBASH BABU, ADVOCATE, SR NO.52056
+1CC TO SPECIAL GOVERNMENT PLEADER, SR NO.52497

W.P. (MD) .No.345 of 2013
28.02.2018

ta

MS/SV-MMS/SAR-3/15.03.2018/3P.8C