



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 21.09.2021

CORAM

WEB COPY

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE G.ILANGO VAN

Crl.O.P. (MD) .No.11545 of 2021

M.Dhivya

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Commissioner of Police,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
Tiruchirappalli City,
Tiruchirappalli.

2.The Inspector of Police,
Fort Police Station, (Law and Order)
Tiruchirappalli City,
Tiruchirappalli.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Criminal Procedure Code, to direct the 2nd respondent not to harass the petitioner and consequently direct the respondents not to interfere with or disturb the peaceful conduct of the petitioner's business offering health therapies under the name and style of LE ZEN MONK (Ayurvedic Care & Spa) at No.301, 302, 2nd Floor, No.168, Hotel Ibras, Karur Bypass Road, Trichy - 2. Hence based on the representation dated 23/07/2021.

For Petitioner : No Appearance

For Respondents : Mr.R.Meenakshi Sundaram
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

(This petition is heard through video conference)

This petition has been filed seeking a direction to the 2nd respondent not to harass the petitioner and consequently direct the respondents not to interfere with or disturb the peaceful conduct of the petitioner's business offering health therapies under the name and style of LE ZEN MONK (Ayurvedic Care & Spa).

2.When the matter was taken up for hearing on 16.08.2021, the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that without proper complaint, the second respondent is making frequent visit and interfering into the smooth running of his massage centre, which is



running under the name and style of LE ZEN MONK (Ayurvedic Care & Spa) .

3.The learned Additional Public Prosecutor submitted that the second respondent inspected the premises only to verify whether proper licence has been obtained as per the Rules. Except that there is no harassment or interference to the running of the massage centre. Therefore, to know whether the petitioner has obtained proper licence from the competent authority or not, the matter is listed today.

4.Today, there is no representation for the petitioner. But, however, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor would submit that this petitioner appeared before the second respondent in the representation made by him, which was assigned C.C.No.388/2021 and during the course of enquiry, the petitioner was informed that only upon the instructions given by the Higher Officials surprise inspection was made and except that there was no harassment. It is also accepted by the petitioner. Hence, the representation made by the petitioner came to be closed.

5.From the enquiry it is seen that only for the purpose of verifying as to whether the petitioner obtained licence, surprise inspection has been undertaken that cannot be considered as harassment, which was also accepted by the petitioner during the course of enquiry. Hence, nothing survives in this petition for further consideration and direction.

6.Recording the above said development, this criminal original petition is dismissed as infructuous.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (Records)

// True Copy //

/ /2021

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

TM

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 Commissioner of Police,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
Tiruchirappalli City,
Tiruchirappalli.

2.The Inspector of Police,
Fort Police Station, (Law and Order)
Tiruchirappalli City,
Tiruchirappalli.

3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.

+1 CC to M/s.C.EZHILARASU, Advocate (SR-29831[F] dated 22/09/2021)

Crl.O.P. (MD) .No.11545 of 2021
21.09.2021

RD(5.10.2021) 3P 5C