



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 24.09.2019

CORAM

WEB COPY

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN

Writ Petition (MD) No.21621 of 2018

and

W.M.P. (MD) No.19526 of 2018

Chermadurai Nadar

... Petitioner

Vs

1.The Director General of Police,
Office of Director General of Police,
Beach Road, Chennai.

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

3.The Inspector of Police,
Sathankulam Police Station,
Sathankulam, Tuticorin District.

4.S.Sakthivel

5.P.Thangadurai

... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India, to issue a writ of Mandamus, forbearing the 3rd respondent to give aid to the 4th and 5th respondents to illegal performances of the festival and any other activities at Mutharamman temple, Keelakulam, Sathankulam Taluk, Tuticorin District and direct the 1st and 2nd respondents to take appropriate action against the 3rd to 5th respondents.

For Petitioners : Mr.T.Vadivelan

For Respondents : Mr.R.Anandharaj, APP
for RR1 to 3

Mr.Pon.Karthikeyan, for RR4 and 5

O R D E R

This writ petition has been filed for issuance of a writ of Mandamus, forbearing the 3rd respondent to give aid to the 4th and 5th respondents to illegal performances of the festival and any other activities at Mutharamman temple, Keelakulam, Sathankulam Taluk,



Tuticorin District and direct the 1st and 2nd respondents to take appropriate action against the 3rd to 5th respondents.

2.This writ petition is nothing but for registration of the complaint. 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.

<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/> (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.

WEB COPY

(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."

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.

3. With the above direction, this Criminal Original Petition is disposed of. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CO)

// True Copy //

Sub Assistant Registrar (CS)

Arul

To

1. The Director General of Police,
Office of Director General of Police,
Beach Road, Chennai.



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

3.The Inspector of Police,
Sathankulam Police Station,
Sathankulam, Tuticorin District.

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

+1 CC to M/s.T.VADIVELAN, Advocate (SR-89724[F] dated 26/09/2019)

+1 CC to M/s.R.Pon Karthikeyan, Advocate, Sr.89087

Order made in
W.P (MD) No.21621 of 2018
24.09.2019

JMN(26.09.2019) 4P : 7C