



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 21.08.2019

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE **V.BHARATHIDASAN**

W.P. (MD)No.5199 of 2018

J.Peermohammed

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The State represented by
The Superintendent of Police,
Sivagangai District.

2.The Inspector of Police,
Pulithipatti Police Station,
Sivagangai District.

3.Rajamanickam

... Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for the issuance of a Writ of Mandamus, directing the second respondent herein to provide adequate police protection to the petitioner, their members of the Pallivasal and also property of the Pallivasal on the basis of the representation of the petitioner dated 26.02.2018.

For Petitioner : Mr.B.Jameel Arasu
For R-1 & R-2 : Mr.K.Suyambulinga Bharathi
Government Advocate
(Criminal side)

O R D E R

This Writ Petition has been filed seeking a direction to the respondents 1 and 2 to give adequate Police protection to the petitioner and their members of the Pallivasal and also the property belongs to the Pallivasal.

2.The grievance of the petitioner is that the petitioner is the Secretary of the Jummath Pallivasal, Pulithipatti. The said Pallivasal is situated in Survey Nos.296/3 and 296/4 in Pulithipatti Village. Now the third respondent and their henchmen are interfering and disturbing with the possession and enjoyment of the



said property and criminally intimidating them. Hence, he made a representation to the second respondent. That was not considered by the second respondent Police. Hence, the present petition has been filed.

3.Today, when the matter was taken up for hearing, the learned Government Advocate (Criminal side) appearing for the respondents 1 and 2, on instructions, submitted that based on a complaint given by the petitioner, enquiry has been conducted by the respondent Police and the Tahsildar, Singampunari, Sivagangai District, has also conducted a Peace Committee Meeting between the parties. During the enquiry, it is found that the allegation made by the petitioner is only exaggeration and the third respondent has not threatened the petitioner and their members and did not interfere with the possession of the property. Thereafter, the respondent Police recorded the statement of both the parties and closed the complaint as "Mistake of fact".

4.Considering the fact that, already the petitioner's complaint has been enquired into and closed, no further orders are required to be passed in this Writ Petition. The Writ Petition stands dismissed accordingly. No costs.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (Crl.Side)

// True Copy //

Sub Assistant Registrar

To

1.The Superintendent of Police,
Sivagangai District.

2.The Inspector of Police,
Pulithipatti Police Station,
Sivagangai District.

Order made in
W.P. (MD)No.5199 of 2018
Dated: **21.08.2019**

tsg
MS/18.09.2019/2P.3C