

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 06.07.2020

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN

W.P.No.5894 of 2020
and WMP.Nos.6904 & 6905 of 2020

Kanagasabai

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Principal Secretary,
Department of Home, Prohibition and Excise,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Fort St.George,
Chennai 600 009.
2. The Director General of Police
Tamil Nadu Police Department,
Dr.Radhakrishnan Road,
Mylapore, Chennai 600 004.
3. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Vepery, Chennai 600 008.
4. The Deputy Commissioner of Police,
Anna Nagar District,
Chennai 600 040.
5. The Assistant Commissioner of Police,
Koyambedu Range,
Chennai 600 107.
6. The Inspector of Police,
K-11, CMBT Police Station,
Chennai 600 107.
7. Mr. Chelladurai,
Sub Inspector of Police
T-4, Maduravoyal Police Station,
Chennai 600 095.

... Respondents

Prayer:- Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of The Constitution of India praying for the issuance of a Writ of Mandamus directing the third respondent to depute the police officer in the rank of Deputy Commissioner of Police to

conduct enquiry on the complaint lodged by the petitioner dated 11.02.2020 and take appropriate department action against the erring police officials.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.R.Senthil Kumar

For Respondents : Mr.K.Prabakaran
Additional Public Prosecutor.

O R D E R

This Writ Petition has been filed to direct the third respondent to depute the police officer in the rank of Deputy Commissioner of Police to conduct enquiry on the complaint lodged by the petitioner dated 11.02.2020 and take appropriate department action against the erring police officials.

2. Heard Mr.M.R.Senthil Kumar, learned counsel for the petitioners and Mr.K.Prabakaran, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the respondent.

3. 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."

4. However, liberty is granted to the petitioner to work out his remedy in accordance with the guidelines issued by the Hon'ble Division Bench in the decision referred supra.

5. With the above direction, this Writ Petition is disposed of. No costs. Consequently connected miscellaneous petition is also closed.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CO MDU)

//True copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

dpq

To

1. The Principal Secretary,
Department of Home, Prohibition and Excise,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Fort St.George, Chennai 600 009.
2. The Director General of Police
Tamil Nadu Police Department,
Dr.Radhakrishnan Road,
Mylapore, Chennai 600 004.
3. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai, Vepery, Chennai 600 008.
4. The Deputy Commissioner of Police,
Anna Nagar District, Chennai 600 040.
5. The Assistant Commissioner of Police,
Koyambedu Range, Chennai 600 107.
6. The Inspector of Police,
K-11, CMBT Police Station, Chennai 600 107.
7. The Sub Inspector of Police
T-4, Maduravoyal Police Station,
Chennai 600 095.
8. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

W.P.No.5894 of 2020
and WMP.Nos.6904 & 6905 of 2020

RLD(CO)
GMY(10/09/2020)

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