

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 27.02.2020

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.DHANDAPANI

CrI.O.P.No.19242 of 2013

N.A.S.Ansari

...

Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Inspector of Police,  
Chidambaram Town Police Station,  
Cr.No.708/2013 .... 1<sup>st</sup> respondent/complainant

2.Mangalam .... 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent /  
defacto complainant

Prayer:

Petition filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C., seeking to allow this CrI.O.P. and call for the records of the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent in connection with the case in Cr.No.708 of 2013 on the file of the Chidambaram Town Police Station and quash the same.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Srinivas

For Respondents : Mr.C.Iyyapparaj for R1  
Additional Public Prosecutor  
Mr.P.Gopalan for R2

O R D E R

This petition has been filed seeking to call for the records of the first respondent in connection with the case in Cr.No.708 of 2013 on the file of the Chidambaram Town Police Station and to quash the same.

2.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the second respondent/ defacto complainant claims that she has decree in civil suit in her favour and the petitioner trespassed into her property and caused damage, however, the fact is that the petitioner is the power agent of his sister and on earlier occasion, the petitioner's sister filed a suit for permanent injunction against the second respondent herein/ defacto complainant in O.S.No.89 of 1999 in

the Sub Court, Chidambaram and the said suit was decreed as prayed for on 20.12.1999.

3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would further submit that, without going into the merits of the case, it would suffice, if this Court permits the petitioner to furnish the particulars before the law enforcing agency to prove his innocence and issue direction to the law enforcing agency to complete the investigation within a time frame.

4.The learned counsel appearing for the second respondent/ defacto complainant would submit that the second respondent has decree in a civil suit in her favour and would further submit that this Court may permit the second respondent to furnish the particulars before the law enforcing agency.

5.The learned Additional Public Prosecutor concedes to the request made by the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and on instructions, he would further submit that the investigation will be completed within the time frame fixed by this Court.

6.Considering the limited request made on either side, this Court without going into the merits of the case, is inclined to issue direction to the law enforcing agency to complete the investigation in Crime No.708 of 2013, after giving opportunity to the petitioner and the second respondent, within a period of twelve weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. The petitioner and the second respondent are directed to co-operate with the law enforcing agency for early completion of the investigation.

7.This criminal original petition is disposed of. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition, if any, is also closed.

सत्यमेव जयते

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

pri

To


1.The Inspector of Police,  
Chidambaram Town Police Station,  
Cr.No.708/2013.

2.The Public Prosecutor,  
High Court of Madras,  
Chennai 600 104.

+lcc to Mr.P.Gopalan, Advocate, S.R.No.17114

Crl.O.P.No.19242 of 2013

sel(CO)  
jrs (27/05/2020)



WEB COPY