



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.21210 of 2024

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 04.12.2024

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE M.NIRMAL KUMAR

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.21210 of 2024

Ramesh

: Petitioner

Vs.

The State of Tamil Nadu

rep., by

1.The Superintendent of Police,
Tirunelveli District.

2.The Inspector of Police,
Mukkudal Police Station,
Tirunelveli District.

3.Chockkalal

4.Kayalvizhi

5.Manibala

: Respondents

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS, to direct the fourth and fifth respondents not to harass the petitioner on the complaint given by the third respondent.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Saravanan

For R1 & R2 : Mr.P.Kottaichamy
Government Advocate (Crl.side)



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.21210 of 2024

ORDER

WEB COPY

The petitioner had sent a representation to the respondent police on 26.10.2024 stating that the third respondent had approached the petitioner to help him mutation of revenue records. The petitioner had introduced VAO for the said job and the third respondent had paid Rs.75,000/- to VAO, Murugan. In the meanwhile, VAO, Murugan, passed away. Hence, the work could not be completed. But, the petitioner is harassed to repay the amount paid to Murugan.

2. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) submitted that on the complaint of third respondent, who is 75 years old person and also sick person, unable to move, had approached for mutation of revenue records. The petitioner claiming that he is friend of VAO and he would facilitate and get the work done and collected Rs.1,00,000/- from the third respondent, thereafter, he failed to do work. Hence, the third respondent had demanded return of money. After complaint, the petitioner appeared before the second respondent police for enquiry and gave undertaking that he would settle the amount. Now, makes claim that he is harassed and it is for the VAO Late.Murugan to pay and not the petitioner.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.21210 of 2024

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that it is true that the petitioner had introduced VAO, Murugan. Now, the petitioner was forced to give an undertaking during earlier enquiry. Further, submitted that the petitioner is ready to appear before the respondent police on 12.12.2024 and also resolve the issue with the third respondent/defacto complainant.

4. In view of the above, the petitioner to appear before the second respondent police on 12.12.2024, give his explanation and the respondent police to conclude the investigation without any delay.

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

04.12.2024

NCC : Yes/No

Index : Yes / No

Rmk

Note :Issue order copy on 11.12.2024

To

1.The Superintendent of Police,
Tirunelveli District.

2.The Inspector of Police,
Mukkudal Police Station,
Tirunelveli District.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.21210 of 2024

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

WEB COPY

M.NIRMAL KUMAR,J.

Rmk

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.21210 of 2024

04.12.2024