



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 06.05.2022

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE **M.S.RAMESH**

Crl.O.P.(MD) No.8917 of 2022

1. R.Ramraj

2. M.Karuppasamy

...Petitioners

Vs.

1. The Superintendent of Police
Dindigul District

2. The Inspector of Police
Batlagundu Police Station
Dindigul District

3. Sundar

...Respondent

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. praying to direct the respondents not to harass the petitioners without any legally sustainable complaint and to direct the respondents to follow the guidelines issued by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in D.K.Basu(1997 1 SCC 416) case in matter pertaining to arrest or interrogation.

For Petitioners	:	Mr.C.Prithiviraj
For Respondents	:	Mr.A.Thiruvadikumar
No.1 and 2		Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

This petition has been filed seeking direction to direct the respondents not to harass the petitioners without any legally sustainable complaint and to direct the respondents to follow the guidelines issued by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **D.K.Basu(1997 1 SCC 416)** case in matter pertaining to arrest or interrogation.

2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that the respondent police harassed the petitioners under the guise of enquiry.

3. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent police submits that on the complaint given by the defacto complainants against the petitioners, petition enquiry is pending on the file of the respondent police

4. Heard the learned Counsel for the petitioners and learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the respondent police.

5. It is the grievance of the petitioners that the respondent police has been harassing them under the guise of an



enquiry/investigation and hence, has invoked the inherent powers of this Court under Section 482 of Cr.P.C.

6. An enquiry into a non cognizable offence or a cognizable offence is the unfettered powers of the Investigation Officers so long as the power to investigate/enquire into these offences are legitimately exercised within the frame work of Chapter XII of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Though the Code of Criminal Procedure empowers the Magistrate to be a guardian in all the stages of the police investigation, there is no power envisaging him to interfere with the actual investigation or the mode of investigation. It is in this background that numerous petitions complaining of harassment are being reported and filed before this Court seeking for directions to refrain the police officials from harassing the persons named in a complaint.

7. This Court, exercising its power under Section 482 of the Criminal Procedure Code normally would not interfere with the investigation conducted by a police officer. Nevertheless, it would also not turn a blind eye to instances of harassment by the police under the guise of investigation is brought to its notice.

8. In the present case in hand, the petitioner has complained of harassment by the police based on a complaint and seek for this Court's intervention by way of a direction. The term 'harassment' by itself has a very wide meaning and hence, what could be harassment to the petitioners may not be the same to the police officer.

9. In order to circumvent such situations, the following guidelines are issued:

a) While summoning any person named in the complaint or any witness to the incident complained of, the police officer shall summon such person through a written summon under Section 160 Cr.P.C., specifying a particular date and time for appearing before them for such an enquiry/investigation.

b) The respondent police is directed to serve summons mentioning the CSR number, date of complaint and the name of the complainant

c) The minutes of the enquiry shall be recorded in the general diary/station diary/daily diary of the police station.

d) The police officer shall refrain himself or herself from harassing persons called upon for enquiry/investigation.

e) The guidelines stipulated for preliminary enquiry or registration of FIR by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Lalita Kumari Vs. Government of Uttar Pradesh and others [2014 (2) SCC (1)]** shall be strictly adhered to.



10. With the above observations and direction, the Criminal Original Petition stands disposed of.

Sd/-

Vacation Officer ()

WEB COPY

// True Copy //

/ /2022

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

Aav

To

1. The Superintendent of Police
Dindigul District

2. The Inspector of Police
Batlagundu Police Station
Dindigul District

Copy to

The Additional Public prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai

Cr1.O.P.(MD) No.8917 of 2022
06.05.2022

SJ(CO)

KB(13.05.2022) 3P 4C