



CrI.O.P.(MD) No.3340 of 2024

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 04.03.2024

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SATHI KUMAR SUKUMARA KURUP

CRL.O.P (MD) No.3340 of 2024

N.Tamilmani

...Petitioner

VS

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

**2.The Inspector of Police,
Manaparai Police Station,
Manaparai,
Trichy District.**

3.Ramachandran

4.Kathiravan

5.Sengutuvan

...Respondents

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C, praying, to direct the 2nd Respondent herein not to harass the Petitioner under the guise of enquiry based on the false complaint preferred by the Respondents 3 to 5 herein before 2nd Respondent.



CrI.O.P.(MD) No.3340 of 2024

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Sarvagan Prabhu

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

ORDER

The learned Counsel for the Petitioner submits that the Petitioner is running a hardware shop in the name and style of 'Hindustan Traders' in a rented premises at Manaparai Taluk, Savalur Village within the local limits of Manaparai Police Station. It is his further submission that the Petitioner herein had entered into a lease agreement with one Amalraj, as per deed dated 14.03.2018. He had been paying the rent regularly. After the death of Amalraj, he had been continuously paying the rent to the wife of Amalraj.

2.While so, a relative of Amalraj had sold part of the property to one Menaka Jothi. The said Menaka Jothi had sold the property to the fourth Respondent herein. Now, based on the sale deed, the Respondents 3 to 5 are attempting to disposes the Petitioner from the suit property. Therefore, the Petitioner was forced to file a suit in O.S.No.13 of 2024 seeking permanent injunction against the Respondents 3 to 5 herein, who are the defendants in



Crl.O.P.(MD) No.3340 of 2024

the suit. While so, based on the complaint of the Respondents 3 to 5, the second Respondent had been summoning the Petitioner often, which causes harassment to him. Therefore, the Petitioner had filed this Petition seeking direction against the Respondents 1 and 2 not to harass him and not to interfere in the civil dispute.

3.The learned Government Advocate (Crl.side), on instructions of the Respondents 1 and 2, submits that one Menaka Jothi had sold the property to the fourth Respondent on 10.03.2022. As on date, there is no complaint received from the Respondents 3 to 5. While the Inspector was going on rounds within his limits, he found crowd on the road in front of the shop. Therefore, he enquired them to prevent any untoward incident. Instead, the Petitioner had come before this Court by filing this Petition.

4.In the light of the submission made by the learned Counsel for the Petitioner and the learned Government Advocate (Crl.side), the Respondents 1 and 2 are directed not to interfere in the civil dispute as per 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



CrI.O.P.(MD) No.3340 of 2024

12.03.2021. Also, the suit filed by the Petitioner is pending against the Respondents 3 to 5. In such circumstances, the Respondents 1 and 2 shall not summon the Petitioner even if the Respondents 3 to 5 prefer any complaint, which is covered by 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.

With the above directions, this Criminal Original Petition is disposed of.

Internet: Yes./No
Index: Yes/No
mm

04.03.2024

To

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

4/5



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD) No.3340 of 2024

SATHI KUMAR SUKUMARA KURUP, J.

mm

CRL.O.P (MD) No.3340 of 2024

04.03.2024