



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT  
( Criminal Jurisdiction )

Date :09.12.2020

PRESENT

The Hon'ble Mr.Justice **G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN**

W.P.(MD)No.16671 of 2017

WEB COPY

J.Vivek

: Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Director General of Police,  
Dr.Radha Krishnan Salai,  
Mylapore, Chennai-600 004.

2.The District Collector,  
Madurai District,  
Madurai.

3.The Superintendent of Police,  
Q Branch CID,  
Dr.Radha Krishnan Salai,  
Chennai.

4.The Inspector of Police,  
Q Branch CID,  
No.37, Guru Nagar,  
Thanakkankulam,  
Madurai-625 006.

: Respondents

**Prayer:** Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for the issuance of a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents to initiate appropriate action based on the petitioner's representation dated 08.08.2017 within a stipulated time limit.


For Petitioner :Mr.A.Jayaramachandran

For Respondents :Mr.K.Suyambulinga Bharathi,  
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

### **O R D E R**

This criminal original petition has been filed to direct the respondents to initiate appropriate action based on the petitioner's representation dated 08.08.2017.

2.The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondents has filed a counter and produced the status report of the fourth respondent. He further submitted that in the status



report, the fourth respondent has stated that on the representation dated 08.08.2017, the third respondent has conducted detailed enquiry on 03.01.2018 and the same was closed on 01.08.2018.

3.Mr.A.Jayaramachandran, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that though the petitioner has involved in so many cases, unnecessarily the fourth respondent has visited his house, taken photographs and made allegations as against him.

4.Per contra, the learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing on behalf of the fourth respondent submitted that the fourth respondent has never visited the house of the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and never had taken photographs. He further submitted that there is no proof to show that the fourth respondent has visited his house and taken photographs.

5.Considering the submission made by the learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side), the prayer sought for by the petitioner has become infructuous. Hence, this writ petition is dismissed as infructuous. No costs. However, the fourth respondent is directed not to indulge any kind of activities as submitted by the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner in future.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CS-III)

// True Copy //

/ /2021


Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

vsg

**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 Director General of Police,  
Dr.Radha Krishnan Salai,  
Mylapore, Chennai-600 004.
- 2.The District Collector,  
Madurai District,  
Madurai.



3.The Superintendent of Police,  
Q Branch CID,  
Dr.Radha Krishnan Salai,  
Chennai.

4.The Inspector of Police,  
Q Branch CID,  
No.37, Guru Nagar,  
Thanakkankulam,  
Madurai-625 006.

+1cc to Mr.A.Jayaramachandran, Advocate Sr.No.25203

W.P. (MD) No.16671 of 2017

09.12.2020

**PU** (CO)

NR (19/01/2020) 3P : 6C