



WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 12.04.2022

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA

W.P.No.9029 of 2022 and
W.M.P.No.8830 of 2022

S.Suriyanarayanan ... Petitioner/Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Commissioner of Police,
No.132, EVK Sambath Road,
Vepery, Periyamet,
Chennai - 600 007.

2. The Deputy Commissioner of Police,
Kilpauk Range, Chennai.

3. The Inspector of Police,
G-2, Periyamet Police Station,
Chennai - 600 003.

4. Chandar Bafna ... Respondents/Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India, pleased to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the 3rd respondent not to pressurize or coerce the petitioner to settled the false claim made by the 4th respondent in respect of the business transaction of the year 2016.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Mohamed Riyaz

For Respondent : Mr.A.Gokulakrishnan
1 to 3 Additional Public Prosecutor

O R D E R

The Writ of Mandamus has been sought to direct the 3rd respondent not to pressurize or coerce the petitioner to settle the false claim made by the 4th respondent in respect of the business transaction of the year 2016.



2. Today, when the matter is taken up for hearing, the learned Counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is engaged in the business of interior designing work from the year 2008 and he had closed down the business during the year 2016. He would further submit that during the course of business, the petitioner had purchased plywood materials from the 4th respondent and payments were fully settled without any dues. While so, based on the complaint lodged by the 4th respondent, the 3rd respondent called the petitioner for enquiry and under the threat of arrest had pressurized the petitioner to settle the dues in respect of the materials supplied during the year 2016. He would further submit that the respondents cannot interfere in the business transaction between the petitioner and the 4th respondent. He would further submit that moreover, the dues are also time barred and whereas the respondent had under threat compelled the petitioner and taken an undertaking that he would settle the amount in three installments.

3. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor would submit that based on the complaint given by the 4th respondent, enquiry has been completed by the 3rd respondent on 28.03.2022 in C.S.R.No.104 of 2022. He would submit that the 3rd respondent has not pressurize the petitioner to settle the clam.

4. Recording the submission, this Writ petition stands disposed of. However, it is made clear that since it is stated that the enquiry had been completed on 28.03.2022, the 3rd respondent shall not harass the petitioner. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

SD/-
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

// TRUE COPY //

SUB ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

vkrr/nti

To

1. The Commissioner of Police,
No.132, EVK Sambath Road,
Vepery, Periyamet,
Chennai - 600 007.



2. The Deputy Commissioner of Police,
Kilpauk Range,
Chennai.

3. The Inspector of Police,
G-2, Periyamet Police Station,
Chennai - 600 003.

4. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.

+lcc to Mr.Mohamed Riyaz, Advocate Sr.25391

W.P.No.9029 of 2022

sr[col]
srg 02/05/2022