



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 11.12.2020

CORAM:

**THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE J.NISHA BANU**

**Crl.O.P(MD)No.14534 of 2020**

V.Nandhagopalan

... Petitioner

Vs

1.The Superintendent of Police  
Trichy District, Trichy.

2.The Deputy Superintendent of Police,  
Lalgudi, Trichy District.

3.The Inspector of Police,  
Lalgudi Police Station,  
Trichy District.

4.PR.Palaniyappan

5.PL.Thaiyalnayagi

... Respondents

**PRAYER:** Petition filed under Section 482 Code of Criminal Procedure, to direct the respondents 1 to 3 to give adequate police protection to the petitioner's life and limb, based on the petitioner's representation dated 02.12.2020.

For Petitioner : Ms.R.Yamuna

For R1 to R3 : Mr.V.Neelakandan,

Additional Public Prosecutor(Crl.Side)

**O R D E R**

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed to direct the respondents 1 to 3 to give adequate police protection to the petitioner's life and limb, based on the petitioner's representation dated 02.12.2020.

2.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner entered into a rental agreement with the respondent Nos. 4 & 5 for running their Rice Mill and paid Rs.3,00,000/- as advance amount and agreed for a monthly rent of Rs.30,000/- for a period of three years. According to the petitioner, he had spent Rs.3,71,000/- towards repairs and maintenance. The grievance of the petitioner is that the respondent Nos. 4 & 5 are threatening the petitioner to vacate the Rice Mill premises, without repaying the advance amount. Hence, the petitioner has made complaint before the respondent police.



Both the parties were called for enquiry and the respondent nos.4 & 5 are agreed to repay a sum of Rs.1,80,000/- to the petitioner, after deducting a sum of Rs.1,20,000/- towards three months rent. According to the petitioner, the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent police is colluded with the respondent Nos. 4 & 5 and they have given continuous threat to the petitioner. Apart from that, in the absence of the petitioner, the Rice Mill was break opened by the person, engaged by the respondent Nos. 4 & 5. Hence, the petitioner has sent a representation to the respondent Nos.1 to 3, for giving police protection. Since no action has been taken by them, the petitioner is before this Court, with this present Criminal Original Petition.

3.The learned Additional Public Prosecutor(Crl.side) appearing on behalf of the respondents 1 & 2, on instructions, would submit that based on the first complaint given by the petitioner in CSR No.829 of 2020 dated 01.10.2020, enquiry has been conducted and closed on the basis of the statement given by the respondent Nos. 4 & 5 that they will repay the amount of Rs. 1,80,000/-. Now, the petitioner has given a fresh complaint for the same issue. He would further submit that it is a landlord and tenant dispute between the petitioner and the respondent Nos. 4 & 5.

4.Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents 1 to 3. Since no adverse order is going to be passed, notice to the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> respondents is dispensed with.

5. Since there is a specific allegation by the petitioner that the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent/police colluded with the respondents 4 & 5 and the rice mill was break open by the person engaged by the respondents 4 & 5, the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent shall consider the petitioner's representation dated 02.12.2020 and take action, after giving opportunity to the respondents 4 & 5 and pass appropriate orders in the manner known to law, within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

6.With the above directions, this criminal original petition is disposed of.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(Writs)

// True Copy //

/ /2021

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)



vrn

**NOTE:** In view of the present lock down owing to COVID-19 pandemic, a web copy of the order may be utilized for official purposes, but, ensuring that the copy of the order that is presented is the correct copy, shall be the responsibility of the advocate/litigant concerned.

**To:-**

- 1.The Superintendent of Police  
Trichy District,  
Trichy.
- 2.The Deputy Superintendent of Police,  
Lalgudi,  
Trichy District.
- 3.The Inspector of Police,  
Lalgudi Police Station,  
Trichy District.
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,  
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,  
Madurai.

**CrI.O.P(MD)No.14534 of 2020**

**11.12.2020**

ES (CO)

TR(15.02.2021) 3P 5C