

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 15.04.2019

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN

Cr1.O.P.No.10224 of 2019

P.Saravanan

... Petitioner

Vs.

- 1.The Superintendent of Police,
Tiruvannamalai District,
Tiruvannamalai.
- 2.The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Tiruvannamalai District,
Tiruvannamalai.
- 3.The Inspector of Police,
Tiruvannamalai Police Station (Taluk)
Tiruvannamalai District,
Tiruvannamalai.
- 4.Thangaraj
Working as Sub-Inspector of Police,
Mangalam Police Station,
Tiruvannamalai District.

5.P.Kannan

6.K.Ganesan

7.K.Krishnan

सत्यमेव जयते... Respondents

Prayer :- Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. to direct the 1st to 3rd respondents to provide the necessary life protection to the petitioner against the 4th to 7th respondents based on his representation dated 02.04.2019.

For Petitioner :Mr.T.V.G.Kartheeban

For Respondents :Mr.M.Mohamed Riyaz
Additional Public Prosecutor.

O R D E R

This petition has been filed seeking direction to the respondents 1 - 3 to provide necessary life protection to the petitioner based on his representation dated 02.04.2019.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the Government pathway in the petitioner's village in survey No.507 was encroached by 5 to 7 respondents and they made a dig of 1.2 meters and length of 8 meters and thereby the entire public pathway was closed by them without usage by farmers of the petitioner's village. Therefore, the petitioner gave a representation dated 02.04.2019 to the 4th respondent. Since, no orders have been passed, the petitioner has filed the present petition with the aforesaid prayer.

3. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor would submit that based on the representation of the petitioner, investigation is still pending.

4. Be that as it may. In view of the Judgment of the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court in CrI.O.P.(MD)No.13681 of 2018 and batch of cases, dated 20.09.2018, the petition of this nature is not maintainable before this Court. The relevant portion of the said order is extracted herewith:-

"35. Accordingly, we answer the references in the following manner, while giving certain directions:

(i) Section 482 Cr.P.C. cannot be invoked in all circumstances.

(ii) It is not an alternative remedy to Section 156(3) Cr.P.C. but a repository of inherent power.

(iii) The normal course of remedy on a failure or refusal to record the information is Section 156(3) of the Code of Criminal Procedure after due compliance of Section 154(3) Cr.P.C.

(iv) A petition can be filed invoking the inherent jurisdiction of this Court only after the completion of 15 days from the date of receipt of the information by the Station House Officer. The Registry shall not receive any petition before the expiry of 15 days aforesaid.

(v) No petition shall be entertained without exhausting the remedy under Section 154(3) Cr.P.C.

(vi) An informant can send substance of the information to the Superintendent of Police on knowing the decision of the Station House Officer in not registering the case and proceeding with the

preliminary enquiry. After conducting the preliminary enquiry, the Station House Officer's decision in either registering the complaint or closing it will have to be intimated to the informant immediately and in any case not later than 7 days. Once such a decision is made, the informant cannot invoke Section 482 Cr.P.C. as the remedy lies elsewhere.

(vii) The directions issued by the Director General of Police in the circulars referred are to be strictly complied with by all the Station House Officers.

(viii) The affidavit to be filed shall contain particulars regarding the date of complaint, receipt and the date of sending substances of the information to the superintendent of Police under Section 154(3) Cr.P.C. and its receipt. The Registry shall not number any petition without due compliance.

(ix) This Court is not bound to direct the police to register the complaint in all cases notwithstanding the breach of time table furnished in Lalitha Kumari's case.

(x) The judicial Magistrates, while dealing the petitions under Sections 156(3) Cr.P.C. are directed to keep in mind the narratives in Lalitha Kumari's case with specific reference to the cases, which might require a preliminary enquiry before issuing a direction to investigate and after careful perusal of the complaint. The other directions issued by the learned Single Judge in Sugesan Transport's case are upheld.

(xi) Eschewing Section 156(3) Cr.P.C. is only on exceptional and rarest of rare cases. Monstrosity of the offence, extreme official apathy and indifference, need to answer the judicial conscience, and existence of hostile environment are few of the factors to be borne in mind to bring a case under the rarest of rare one."

5. In view of the above, the prayer sought for in this petition seeking police protection cannot be entertained. However, liberty is granted to the petitioner to work out his remedy in accordance with the guidelines given by the Hon'ble Division Bench in the decision referred supra.

6. With the above observations, this Criminal Original Petition is disposed of.

Sd/-
Deputy Registrar

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

rri

To

- 1.The Superintendent of Police,
Tiruvannamalai District,
Tiruvannamalai.
- 2.The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Tiruvannamalai District,
Tiruvannamalai.
- 3.The Inspector of Police,
Tiruvannamalai Police Station (Taluk)
Tiruvannamalai District,
Tiruvannamalai.
4. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

+1cc to Mr.Karthiban, Advocate Sr.36957

सत्यमेव जयते

Cr1.O.P.No.10224 of 2019

rsv[co]
srg 11/06/2019

WEB COPY