



CrI.O.P.(MD) No.3279 of 2024

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 01.03.2024

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SATHI KUMAR SUKUMARA KURUP

CRL.O.P (MD) No.3279 of 2024

Savitha

...Petitioner

VS

**1.The Superintendent of Police,
Sivagangai District,
Sivagangai.**

**2.The Inspector of Police,
Thirukoshtiyur Police Station,
Sivagangai District.**

3.Vijayalakshmi

...Respondents

**PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C,
praying, to direct the 2nd Respondent not to harass the Petitioner in the guise
of enquiry.**

For Petitioner : Mr.V.Thirumal

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



Crl.O.P.(MD) No.3279 of 2024

ORDER

WEB COPY

The learned Counsel for the Petitioner submits that the Petitioner had filed this Petition seeking direction against the second Respondent not to harass the Petitioner under the guise of enquiry. It is his submission that the third Respondent is none other than the wife of the brother of the Petitioner. The brother of the Petitioner suffered Kidney ailment. The Petitioner had met the medical expenses of her brother. Subsequently, the brother of the Petitioner died. After the death of the Petitioner's brother, the third Respondent had been living an immoral life. During the life time of the Petitioner's brother, the third Respondent voluntarily sold the Car belonging to the brother of the Petitioner to the Petitioner. After the payment of the sale amount, the ownership of the Car was also transferred in the name of the Petitioner. The third Respondent had also executed a deed to that effect. While so, the third Respondent is alleged to have given a complaint, as though the Petitioner had forcibly taken away her Car, which is not true. Based on the complaint of the third Respondent, the second Respondent had been summoning the Petitioner on mobile phone. Therefore, the Petitioner was forced to file this Petition seeking directions against the second Respondent not to harass the Petitioner under the guise of enquiry.



Crl.O.P.(MD) No.3279 of 2024

WEB COPY

2.The learned Government Advocate (Crl.side), on instructions of the Respondents 1 and 2, submits that both the Petitioner as well as the third Respondent had given complaints against each other. The complaint given by the third Respondent was registered as CSR.No.36 of 2024 and the complaint given by the Petitioner was taken on file as current paper. Both are pending enquiry. He would further submit that the Respondent Police are ready to follow the guidelines 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 and to conclude the enquiry.

3.Considering the dispute between the sisters-in-law, the Respondents 1 and 2 are directed to follow 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 warning the Field Officers not to entertain any dispute involving property and money.



Crl.O.P.(MD) No.3279 of 2024

With the above directions, this Criminal Original Petition is disposed

of.

WEB COPY

Internet: Yes./No

01.03.2024

Index: Yes/No

mm

To

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



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD) No.3279 of 2024

SATHI KUMAR SUKUMARA KURUP, J.

mm

CRL.O.P (MD) No.3279 of 2024

01.03.2024