

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 03.09.2020

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.NIRMAL KUMAR

Cr1.O.P.No.12947 of 2020

Ramesh
S/o.Manokaran

...Petitioner

Vs.

- 1.The Central /vigilance Commissiner,
Central Vigilance Commission Office,
New Delhi.
- 2.The Chief Vigilance Commissioner,
The State of Tamil Nadu,
Vigilance and Anti-Corruption Department,
Secretariate,
Fort St.George,
Chennai - 600 009.
- 3.The Director,
Vigilance and Anti Corruption Wing,
Alandur,
Chennai - 600 016.

...Respondents

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, to direct the first respondent to register and investigate the complaint of the petitioner dated 10.07.2020 in accordance with law.

For Petitioner :Mr.M.Velmurugan
No Appearance

For Respondents:Mr.C.Iyyappa Raj
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

Earlier on two occasions i.e (on 26.08.2020 & 28.08.2020) there was no representation for the petitioner. Therefore, the matter came up for hearing today i.e (03.09.2020) under the caption "for dismissal". Today also there is no representation on behalf of the petitioner. Hence the petition is taken up for

disposal.

2. It is seen that the petitioner has sent representation dated 10.07.2020 and 11.07.2020 to the respondents. On perusal of the complaint it is seen that the petitioner is residing at Ezhumattur Village, Thittakudi Taluk, Cuddalore. The road widening work between Virudhachalam to Thozhuthur for 40 Kilometres under the scheme of Central Road Development to the tune of Rs.49 crores and the 50% of the works is completed. The petitioner makes certain corruption allegations committed in execution of work.

3. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor submitted that the complaint sent by the petitioner on 10.07.2020 and 11.07.2020 had been addressed to R1. As regards R2 and R3 no representation has been sent to them. Further he submitted that the petitioner without following the dictum of this Court in the case of Prabhakaran Vs. The Superintendent of Police, Thanjavur District and Others reported in 2018 5 CTC 623. Hence the petition is not maintainable.

4. Considering the submissions made by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor and the facts of the case, this Court inclined to dismiss the Criminal Original Petition finding that the petitioner has not followed the dictum of this Court.

5. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar

// True Copy //

Sub Assistant Registrar

rst

To


1. The Central Vigilance Commissioner,
Central Vigilance Commission Office,
New Delhi.
2. The Chief Vigilance Commissioner,
The State of Tamil Nadu,
Vigilance and Anti-Corruption Department,
Secretariate,
Fort St. George,
Chennai - 600 009.

3. The Director,
Vigilance and Anti Corruption Wing,
Alandur,
Chennai - 600 016.

4. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

CrI.O.P.No.12947 of 2020

NRL (CO)
GS (22/10/2020)



WEB COPY