



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: **09.03.2021**

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE **R.THARANI**

W.P. (MD)No.4953 of 2021

and

W.M.P. (MD)No.4020 of 2021

WEB COPY

1.Sudha Rajaram
2.Rajaram
3.Gandhimathi

... Petitioners

Vs

1.The Superintendent of Police,
Virudhunagar.

2.The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Aruppukottai,
Virudhunagar District.

3.The Inspector of Police,
Aruppukottai Town Police Station,
Aruppukottai,
Virudhunagar District.

4.Jeyabala Murali

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Mandamus, forbearing the respondents 1 to 3 from interfering the civil matrimonial dispute and property dispute between the first petitioner and the fourth respondent.

For Petitioner	: Mr.T.R.Jeyapalam
For Respondents 1 to 3	: Mr.S.Chandrasekar
	Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed for issuance of a Writ of Mandamus, thereby forbearing the respondents 1 to 3 from interfering the civil matrimonial dispute and property dispute between the first petitioner and the fourth respondent.

2.On the side of the petitioners, it is stated that the first petitioner is the wife of the fourth respondent. The petitioners 2 and 3 are the parents of the first petitioner. The respondents 1 to



3 colluded with the fourth respondent and harassed the petitioners and they issued summons for the appearance of the petitioners. The petitioner appeared before the respondents 1 to 3 for three times and pray for an order against the respondents 1 to 3 not to interfere in the civil matrimonial dispute has to be passed.

WEB COPY

3. On the side of the respondents 1 to 3, it is stated that the fourth respondent has filed a complaint before the third respondent. It is stated that the signature of the fourth respondent was forged in the visa extension application for the minor child. The petition was registered as C.R.No.53 of 2021 dated 16.02.2021. Though summons were issued twice, the petitioner failed to appear. Only once the first petitioner appeared before the respondents 1 to 3. But she refused to give her sample signature for comparison and the enquiry is pending for want of the sample signature of the petitioners.

4. It is seen that the allegation imposed upon the petitioner is not a matrimonial dispute. It is only with regard to forgery. The petitioners are duty bound to cooperate the enquiry. Hence, this Court directed the petitioners to cooperate the enquiry to be conducted by the respondents 1 to 3. The respondents 1 to 3 are hereby directed not to physically harass the petitioners during enquiry.

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

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(CS-III)

// True Copy //

/ /2021

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

Mrn

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,
Virudhunagar.

2. The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Aruppukottai,
Virudhunagar District.



3.The Inspector of Police,
Aruppukottai Town Police Station,
Aruppukottai,
Virudhunagar District.

+1 CC to M/s.T.R.JEYAPALAM, Advocate (SR-10490[F] dated
11/03/2021)

W.P. (MD)No.4953 of 2021
09.03.2021

TR(16.03.2021) 3P 5C