



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.20643 of 2022

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

Dated: 25.11.2022

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SATHI KUMAR SUKUMARA KURUP

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.20643 of 2022

Sulochana

... Petitioner

Vs.

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

2.The Inspector of Police,
Manapparai Police Station,
Manapparai,
Trichirappalli District.

3.Syed Abuthaheer

4.Shajahan

...Respondents

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C.
praying to issue direction directing the second Respondent not to harass
the Petitioner without following due process of law.

For Petitioner	: Mr.R.Murugappan
For R1 – R2	: Mr.T.Senthilkumar
	Additional Public Prosecutor



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.20643 of 2022

ORDER

WEB COPY

This Petition had been filed to direct the second Respondent not to harass the Petitioner under the guise of enquiry.

2.The learned Counsel appearing for the Petitioner submitted that the Petitioner was employed in the Brothers Mini Super Market of the Respondents 3 and 4 Near Library, Gandhi Nagar, Manapparai, Tiruchirappalli District more than six years and stopped from attending work from 30.08.2022, as the Respondents 3 and 4 had not given salary regularly. On 17.11.2022, the second Respondent taken the Petitioner from her house to the second Respondent Police Station under the influence of the Respondents 3 and 4 and harassed her to give Rs.8 lakhs to the Respondents 3 and 4. Therefore, she had preferred a complaint before the first Respondent. Instead of enquire the complaint of the Petitioner, she had been directed to part with Rs.8 lakhs. Hence, she had approached this Court seeking direction as above.

3.The learned Additional Public Prosecutor submitted that as per the reported Ruling of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Lalitha***



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.20643 of 2022

WEB COPY

Kumari Vs. Government of Uttar Pradesh reported in **2013 (6) CTC**

353, the second Respondent had issued summon to the Petitioner.

Instead of co-operate with the enquiry, the Petitioner had immediately approached this Court.

4.In the light of the above, the second Respondent is directed to enquire into the allegation levelled against the Respondents 1 to 3. If found that it is *bona fide*, register a case and investigate the same. The Petitioner is directed to co-operate with the pending investigation. The Respondents 1 and 2 are directed not to harass the Petitioner and also to follow the guidelines issued by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of ***Lalitha Kumari Vs. Government of Uttar Pradesh*** reported in **2013 (6) CTC 353**.

5.With the above direction, the Criminal Original Petition is disposed of.

25.11.2022

Index: Yes/No
vsd

3/4



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.20643 of 2022

SATHI KUMAR SUKUMARA KURUP, J.

vsd

To

- 1.The Superintendent of Police,
Trichirappalli District,
Trichirappalli.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
Manapparai Police Station,
Manapparai,
Trichirappalli District.
- 3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.20643 of 2022

25.11.2022