

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS  
DATED: 22.02.2019  
CORAM:  
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN  
Crl.O.P.No.4499 of 2019

G.Banumitra

.. Petitioner

Vs

The State Rep. by  
S-3 Inspector of Police  
Meenabakkam Police Station  
Chennai.

.. Respondent

Prayer :- Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. to direct the respondent not to harass the petitioner.

For Petitioner : Mr.C.P.Palanichamy  
For Respondent : Mr.M.Mohamed Riyaz  
Addl. Public Prosecutor

O R D E R

This petition has been filed seeking direction to the respondent police not to harass the petitioner in connection with Crime No.Not known of 2018 pending on the file of respondent Police..

2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the respondent police harassed the petitioner under the guise of enquiry.

3. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent police submits that on the complaint given by the defacto complainants against the petitioners, petition enquiry is pending.

4. Heard the learned Counsel for the petitioner and learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the respondent police.

5. It is the grievance of the petitioner that the respondent police have been harassing them under the guise of an enquiry/investigation and hence, has invoked the inherent powers of this Court under Section 482 of Cr.P.C.

6. An enquiry into a non cognizable offence or a cognizable offence is the unfettered powers of the Investigation Officers so long as the power to investigate/enquire into these offences are legitimately exercised within the frame work of Chapter XII of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Though the Code

of Criminal Procedure empowers the Magistrate to be a guardian in all the stages of the police investigation, there is no power envisaging him to interfere with the actual investigation or the mode of investigation. It is in this background that numerous petitions complaining of harassment are being reported and filed before this Court seeking for directions to refrain the police officials from harassing the persons named in a complaint.

7. This Court, exercising its power under Section 482 of the Criminal Procedure Code normally would not interfere with the investigation conducted by a police officer. Nevertheless, it would also not turn a blind eye to instances of harassment by the police under the guise of investigation is brought to its notice.

8. In the present case in hand, the petitioners have complained of harassment by the police based on a complaint and seek for this Court's intervention by way of a direction. The term 'harassment' by itself has a very wide meaning and hence, what could be harassment to the petitioners may not be the same to the police officer.

9. In order to circumvent such situations, the following guidelines are issued:

a) While summoning any person named in the complaint or any witness to the incident complained of, the police officer shall summon such person through a written summon under Section 160 Cr.P.C., specifying a particular date and time for appearing before them for such an enquiry/investigation.

b) The minutes of the enquiry shall be recorded in the general diary/station diary/daily diary of the police station.

c) The police officer shall refrain himself or herself from harassing persons called upon for enquiry/investigation.

d) The guidelines stipulated for preliminary enquiry or registration of FIR by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Lalita Kumari Vs. Government of Uttar Pradesh and others [2014 (2) SCC (1)] shall be strictly adhered to.

10. With the above observations and direction, the Criminal Original Petition stands disposed of.

Sd/-  
Assistant Registrar(CO)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

lpp/vsn

To

1.The State Rep. by  
S-3 Inspector of Police  
Meenabakkam Police Station  
Chennai.

2.The Public Prosecutor,  
High Court, Madras.

Cr1.O.P.No.4499 of 2019

ev(co)  
nr 28/03/2019



WEB COPY