



WEB COPY

CONT.P.No.3057 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 13.08.2024

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE V.SIVAGNANAM

CONT.P.No.3057 of 2023

Arul

... Petitioner

Vs.

Mr.N.Settu,
The Sub-Inspector of Police / Station House Officer,
Edaikkal Police Station,
Ulundurpettai Taluka,
Kallakurichi District – 606 305.
(Crime No.81/2023)

... Respondent

Prayer: Contempt Petition has been filed under Section 11 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, pleased to punish the respondent for his wilful disobedience of the order passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Criminal Appeal No.1277 of 2014 on 02.07.2014.

For Petitioner : Mr.N.Ponraj

For Respondent : Mr.E.Raj Thilak
Additional Public Prosecutor
: Mr.V.Sivalingam
For Mr.V.Vijaya Kumar



CONT.P.No.3057 of 2023

ORDER

WEB COPY

[Order of the Court was made by **S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.**]

The contempt proceedings has been initiated to punish the respondent for his wilful disobedience of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of *Arnesh Kumar vs. State of Bihar*¹.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the mandatory requirement of Notice under Section 41-A of the Criminal Procedure Code has not been issued to the petitioner before carrying out the arrest. Thus, the Police Officer has committed contempt wilfully and therefore, liable to be punished.

3. Every procedural lapses by the Police Officer would not provide cause for initiation of contempt proceedings. In the case of *Arnesh Kumar* cited supra, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India laid down guidelines for initiation of action. Wherever required, Notice under Section 41-A is to be issued before effecting arrest.

1 [(2014) 8 SCC 273]



CONT.P.No.3057 of 2023

WEB COPY

4. In the present case, the allegation of the petitioner is that the respondent violated the procedure and also Section 41-A. Therefore, liable to be punished.

5. It seems to be hard to accept such proposition mooted out by the petitioner, since it may be a procedural lapse on the part of the Police Officer. If at all such procedural lapse caused any prejudice, the petitioner has to seek appropriate remedy before the Court concerned or make a complaint against such Police Official to the Department for initiation of disciplinary proceedings. Contrarily, contempt petition would not lie.

6. In the event of allowing the contempt proceedings for each and every lapse being committed by the Police Officer, they may not be in a position to perform their duties freely in the manner contemplated. Therefore, we are not inclined to entertain the contempt petition.



CONT.P.No.3057 of 2023

7. Accordingly, the Contempt Petition stands dismissed. No costs.

WEB COPY

[S.M.S., J.] [V.S.G., J.]
13.08.2024

Jeni
Index : Yes
Speaking order
Neutral Citation : Yes

To

The Sub-Inspector of Police / Station House Officer,
Edaikkal Police Station,
Ulundurpettai Taluka,
Kallakurichi District – 606 305.
(Crime No.81/2023)



WEB COPY



CONT.P.No.3057 of 2023

S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.
and
V.SIVAGNANAM, J.

Jeni

CONT.P.No.3057 of 2023

13.08.2024