



Crl.O.P.(MD) No.3110 of 2024

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 28.02.2024

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SATHI KUMAR SUKUMARA KURUP

CRL.O.P (MD) No.3110 of 2024

Nagoorammal

...Petitioner

vs

1.The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Tenkasi,
Tenkasi District.

2.The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Tenkasi,
Tenkasi District.

3.Jammema Banu

...Respondents

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C, praying, directing the 2nd Respondent not to harass the Petitioner on the basis of the complaint of 3rd Respondent.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Saravana Kumar

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



CrI.O.P.(MD) No.3110 of 2024

ORDER

WEB COPY

The learned Counsel for the Petitioner submits that the Petitioner is a senior citizen. The son of the Petitioner married the third Respondent on 14.03.2010. From the date of marriage, the son and daughter-in-law of the Petitioner are residing separately. While so, the third Respondent had given a complaint, as though the Petitioner sought extra dowry. Based on the complaint of the third Respondent, the second Respondent had been harassing the Petitioner quite often by summoning her on mobile phone to appear before the second Respondent. Therefore, the Petitioner was forced to file this Petition seeking not to harass her. She had been falsely implicated. There appears to be a dispute between the husband and wife. They are living separately away from the Petitioner. While so, the third Respondent had wantonly given a complaint only to harass the Petitioner, based on which the second Respondent summoned the Petitioner on mobile phone at odd hours.

2.The learned Government Advocate (CrI.side), on instructions of the second Respondent, submits that earlier a complaint was given, based on



Crl.O.P.(MD) No.3110 of 2024

which CSR.No.574 of 2023 was registered and after enquiry, it was closed on 22.08.2023. Now, current paper is received on 14.02.2024. He would further submit that the Police will complete the investigation and close the same within a week.

3.The learned Counsel for the Petitioner by way of reply submits that in the previous case, the Petitioner was not at all a party.

4.On considering the submissions made by the learned Counsel for the Petitioner and the learned Government Advocate (Crl.side), the Respondents 1 and 2 are directed to act as per the reported ruling of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Lalitha Kumari Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh*** reported in ***(2014) 2 SSC 1*** and not to harass the Petitioner in a matrimonial dispute involving the son and daughter-in-law of the Petitioner. When the Petitioner is residing separately, there is no ground to summon her. The Respondents 1 and 2 shall abide by the reported ruling of the Hon'ble Supreme Court.



Crl.O.P.(MD) No.3110 of 2024

With the above directions, this Criminal Original Petition is disposed

of.

WEB COPY

Internet: Yes./No

28.02.2024

Index: Yes/No

mm

To

- 1.The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Tenkasi,
Tenkasi District.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Tenkasi,
Tenkasi District.
- 3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD) No.3110 of 2024

SATHI KUMAR SUKUMARA KURUP, J.

mm

CRL.O.P (MD) No.3110 of 2024

28.02.2024