



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 19.05.2022

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE T.V.THAMILSELVI

Crl.O.P. (MD) No.9394 of 2022

M.Vairamani

... Petitioner

Vs

1. The Superintendent of Police,
Dindigul District, Dindigul.

2. The Inspector of Police,
Pattiveeranpatti Police Station,
Dindigul District.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. praying to direct the respondents not to harass the petitioner under the guise of enquiry by interfering the peaceful possession and enjoyment of the petitioner's house property in S.No.390/3, Door NO.19/19 at the extent of 1260 Sq ft. situated at Nellur Village, Athur Taluk, Dindigul District.

For Petitioner : Mr.J.Selvam

For Respondents : Mr.M.Sakthi Kumar
Government Advocate

ORDER

This petition has been filed seeking direction to direct the respondents not to harass the petitioner under the guise of enquiry by interfering the peaceful possession and enjoyment of the petitioner's house property in S.No.390/3, Door NO.19/19 at the extent of 1260 square feet, situated at Nellur Village, Athur Taluk, Dindigul District.

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

3.The learned Government Advocate appearing for the respondent police submits that on the complaint given by the defacto complainant against the petitioner, petition enquiry is pending on the file of the respondent police.



4. Heard the learned Counsel for the petitioner and learned Government Advocate for the respondent police.

5. It is the grievance of the petitioner is that the respondent police had been harassing him 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 petitioner 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.In view of the above, the second respondent is directed to complete the enquiry and dispose of the same, within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of the order.

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

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CS-III)

// True Copy //

/ /2022

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

lr

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,
Dindigul District, Dindigul.
2. The Inspector of Police,
Pattiveeranpatti Police Station,
Dindigul District.
3. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.

Crl.O.P.(MD) No.9394 of 2022

19.05.2022

USK/01.06.2022/3P/4C