



W.P(MD). No.13569 of 2019

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

Date : 03.04.2024

CORAM

The Hon`ble Mr.Justice A.A.NAKKIRAN

W.P(MD). No.13569 of 2019

Bala Vigiria Weaving Mills (P) Ltd.,
Rep. By its Finance Director,
Unit – IV,
S.Krishnamoorthy

Petitioner / Accused

Vs

1. The District Superintendent of Police,
District Police Office,
Dindigul.

2.The Manager,
Pallapatti SIPCOT,
Nilakkottai Taluk,
Dindigul District.

3.The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Nilakkottai,
Dindigul.

4.The Inspector of Police,
Amaiyanayakkanoor Police Station,
Dindigul District.

5.S.Jeyamani
6.P. Arivalagan

Respondents

PRAYER :- This Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the



W.P(MD). No.13569 of 2019

Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Mandamus directing the respondents 1 to 4 to consider this petitioner's representation, dated 05.06.2019 and consequently, direct the respondents 1 to 4 to take appropriate action against the 5th and 6th respondents.

For Petitioners : Mr.B. Senthilkumar

For Respondents 1, 3 and 4 : Mr.R.M. Anbunithi
Additional Public Prosecutor

For respondent No.6 : Mr. G. Xavier

ORDER

This Writ Petition has been filed praying for issuance of a Writ of Mandamus directing the respondents 1 to 4 to consider the petitioner's representation, dated 05.06.2019 and consequently, direct the respondents 1 to 4 to take appropriate action against the 5th and 6th respondents.

2. The petitioner herein is the Finance Director of Balavigna Weaving Mills (P) Ltd., and they have four units in and around Dindigul District. They have started IV unit in the Industrial Estate, SIPCOT, Nilakkottai Taluk, which comes under 2nd respondent jurisdiction, and provided employment to the skilled labourers. While so, the respondents 5



W.P(MD). No.13569 of 2019

and 6 sent a letter to the petitioner stating that they are not giving job opportunities to the persons, who are under their Association. In such circumstances, the petitioner sent a representation, dated 05.06.2019 to the respondent police to consider his representation and consequently, direct the respondent police to take appropriate action against the 5th and 6th respondent.

3. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondents 1 to 4 vehemently opposed for granting such a direction to the respondents stating that the matter is purely civil in nature. Hence, the petitioner has to seek remedy only before the Civil Court.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the respondents 5 and 6 submitted that now, the 5th respondent is no more and the 6th respondent has not made any trouble to the petitioner and prayed for dismissal of this petition.

5. Heard the submissions made by the learned counsels on either side and perused the materials on record.



W.P(MD). No.13569 of 2019

WEB COPY

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsels on either side and also considering the fact the matter is purely civil in nature, this Court is not inclined to allow this petition.

7. Accordingly, this Writ Petition is dismissed. If the 6th respondent is creating any trouble or put nuisance, the petitioner got every right to lodge a complaint before the concerned authority. No costs.

03.04.2024

Index : Yes / No
Internet: Yes / No
trp

To

1. The District Superintendent of Police,
District Police Office, Dindigul.

2. The Manager,
Pallapatti SIPCOT,
Nilakkottai Taluk, Dindigul District.

3. The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Nilakkottai, Dindigul.

4. The Inspector of Police,
Amaiyanayakkanoor Police Station,
Dindigul District.

5. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



W.P(MD). No.13569 of 2019

A.A.NAKKIRAN,J

TRP

WP(MD). No.13569 of 2019

03.04.2024