



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.3237 of 2024

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED : 29.02.2024

CORAM :

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SATHI KUMAR SUKUMARA KURUP

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.3237 of 2024

R. Chandrasekaran

... Petitioner

Vs.

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

2. The Inspector of Police,
Samayanallur Police Station,
Madurai,
Madurai District.

3. V.Illayaraja

... Respondents

Prayer : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, praying to direct the second Respondent not to harass the Petitioner under the guise of an enquiry.

For Petitioner : Mr.A.S.Krishnan

For R1 & R2 : Mr.M.Veeranthiran
Government Advocate (Crl. side)



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.3237 of 2024

ORDER

WEB COPY

The learned Counsel for the Petitioner submitted that the Petitioner had filed this petition seeking direction against the Respondent Police not to harass the Petitioner under the guise of an enquiry.

2.The learned Counsel for the Petitioner further submitted that the Petitioner is the land lord. The third Respondent, who is the tenant had lodged a complaint with the second Respondent. Based on which the second Respondent had summoned the Petitioner and caused harassment to him. Therefore, the Petitioner seeks direction against the Respondent Police not to harass the Petitioner under the guise of an enquiry.

3.The learned Government Advocate (Criminal side) on instructions from the Respondent Police submitted that the Petitioner had entered into a lease agreement with the third Respondent. After receiving the amount of Rs.1,00,000/- (Rupees One Lakh only), the Petitioner is alleged to have put up a tin sheet go-down for the use of the tenant/third Respondent. Subsequently, the third Respondent vacated. Therefore, the third Respondent sought refund of the advance amount of Rs.1,00,000/- (Rupees One Lakh) for which the Petitioner refused to give the said amount. Therefore, the third Respondent lodged a complaint with the second



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.3237 of 2024

Respondent. The second Respondent had registered a case in C.S.R.No.95 of 2024 in which the third Respondent appeared, but the Petitioner did not appear before the Respondent Police. Instead, the Petitioner had filed this petition.

4.The learned Government Advocate (Criminal side) undertakes that after conducting an enquiry, the same will be closed .

5.Considering the submissions of the learned Counsel for the Petitioner and the learned Government Advocate (Criminal side), the Respondent Police are directed not to interfere in civil dispute involving land lord and tenant. It attracts the circular of the Director General of Police, Head of State Police Force, Tamil Nadu State, Chennai -4 issued in Rc.No.892914/X1/2020 dated 12.03.2021.

6.With the above said direction, this Criminal Original Petition is disposed of.

29.02.2024

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No
jbr



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.3237 of 2024

SATHI KUMAR SUKUMARA KURUP, J.,

jbr

To

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

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.3237 of 2024

29.02.2024