



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 21.01.2022

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE DR.JUSTICE G.JAYACHANDRAN

W.P. (MD) . No. 12349 of 2019

Jeyalakshmi

... Petitioner

-Vs-

1. The Director General of Police,
Office of the Director General of Police,
Dr.Radhakrishnan Road,
Chennai.
2. The Inspector General of Police,
Central Zone,
Trichy.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Office of the Superintendent of Police,
Thanjavur District.
4. The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Office of the Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Orathanadu,
Thanjavur District.
5. The Inspector of Police,
Pappanadu Police Station,
Thanjavur District.
6. Jeya
The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station, Thanjavur District.
7. Kamaraj,
The Sub-Inspector of Police,
Vathathikottai Police Station,
Thanjavur District.

... Respondents

PRAYER : Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Mandamus directing the first to fifth respondents to take appropriate action against the sixth and seventh respondents on the basis of the petition submitted by the petitioner dated 20.05.2019 and on the basis of the guidelines issued by the Hon'ble Constitutional Bench of the Supreme



Court of India in Lalitha Kumari case reported in (2014)2 SCC 1 in accordance with law.

For Petitioner : M/s.R.Alagumani
For Respondents : Mr.P.Kottai Chamy
Government Advocate

WEB COPY

O R D E R

The allegation of the petitioner herein is that her complaint dated 20.05.2019 had not been acted upon by the respondent Police. However, the counter filed by the fifth respondent indicates that on 19.05.2019, the petitioner's family and family of one Ramanathan had a quarrel and both came to the Police Station and lodged a complaint, the same came to be numbered as C.S.R. Nos. 180 and 181 of 2019 and taken up for investigation. While so, the petitioner herein on 20.05.2019 preferred another complaint stating that her daughter aged about 14 was teased by seven named persons who belong to Ramanathan's family. Pursuant to that, the case was registered and enquiry was conducted. From the enquiry, it was revealed that, no incident as is alleged in the complaint of the petitioner dated 20.05.2019 took place and the content in the complaint are false and frivolous. Whereas, the complaint by the petitioner against Ramanathan's family and the complaint of the Ramanathan against the petitioner's family after preliminary investigation, was registered in Crime Nos. 52 and 53 of 2019 for offences under Sections 147, 294 (b), 323, 506(i) IPC and after completion of investigation, a final report has been filed.

2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the occurrence dated 20.05.2019 is graver in nature and the Police has failed to properly investigate the case. The perusal of the complaint dated 20.05.2019 addressed to nine Higher Officials including State Commission for Women, Human Rights Commission, Women Secretary, Child Welfare Commission indicates that, due to dispute between the petitioner's family and Ranganathan's family, certain incidents have taken place on 20.05.2019 and thereafter, the complaint has been forwarded to all the authorities alleging that the Police has not taken action against the complaint. However, in the counter filed by the fifth respondent, it is stated that no incident as is alleged in the complaint of the petitioner dated 20.05.2019 took place. The Police after investigation has found that the offence under Sections 147, 294(b), 323, 506(i) IPC has been made out against the Ramanathan's family. On completion of investigation, they have filed final report also. The version of the petitioner have been found to be false, hence direction sought in the prayer cannot be entertained.



3. Hence, the Writ Petition is dismissed. However, there shall be no order as to costs.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (AD-I)

// True Copy //

WEB COPY

/ /2022

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

vji

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 Director General of Police,
Office of the Director General of Police,
Dr.Radhakrishnan Road,
Chennai.
2. The Inspector General of Police,
Central Zone,
Trichy.
3. The Superintendent of Police,
Office of the Superintendent of Police,
Thanjavur District.
4. The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Office of the Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Orathanadu,
Thanjavur District.
5. The Inspector of Police,
Pappanadu Police Station,
Thanjavur District.
6. The Additional Public prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai

W.P. (MD) . No. 12349 of 2019
21.01.2022

KM(CO)
KB(15.02.2022) 3P 7C