



WEB COPY

WP No. 10890 of 2024



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 21-08-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE N. SATHISH KUMAR

WP No. 10890 of 2024

1. M.Kannamal

W/o.Mariappan, Marialam Post,
Anchetty Tk, Krishnagiri District.

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The Superintendent Of Police,
Krishnagiri District.

2.The Deputy Superintendent Of Police,
Anchetty Circle And Taluk, Krishnagiri
District.

3.The Inspector Of Police,
Anchetty Police Station, Krishnagiri
District.

4.R.Muniyammal
W/o.Rajagopal, D.No.4/237, Ramar
Kovil Village, Mariyalam Post,
Anchetty Taluk, Krishnagiri District.

5.MEENA
W/o.Sakthivel, D.No.4/237, Ramar
Kovil Village, Mariyalam Post,
Anchetty Taluk, Krishnagiri District.



6.MANICKAMMAL

W/o.Munusamy, D.No.4/237, Ramar

Kovil Village, Mariyalam Post,
Anchetty Taluk, Krishnagiri District.

7.M.Muniyammal,

W/o.Moorthy, D.No.4/237, Ramar

Kovil Village, Mariyalam Post,
Anchetty Taluk, Krishnagiri District.

Respondent(s)

PRAYER : Writ Petition filed under Article 227 of Constitution of India directing the respondents 1 to 3 to provide adequate police protection to the petition for cultivation of lands in S.No.576/1A, and S.No.576 1F total to an extent of 1.40 acres situated at Anchetty Village and to construct the toilet in the above land near petitioner residential house within Anchetty Village, Anchetty Taluk, Krishnagiri District based on the petitioner representation dated on 11.03.2024

For Petitioner(s): R.Balaguruswamy

For Respondent(s): Mr.K.M.D.Muhilan
Additional Public Prosecutor – R1 to R3

Mr. T.Sundaravadanam – R5 to R7



ORDER

WEB COPY

This Writ Petition has been filed to direct the respondents 1 to 3 to provide adequate police protection to the petitioner for cultivation of his lands and to construct the toilet in the above land near petitioner's residential house based on the petitioner representation dated on 11.03.2024.

2. The case of the petitioner is that the respondents 4 to 7 along with some villagers are trespassing into the property of the petitioner and disturbing his possession and illegally restraining the petitioner from cultivating his land and to construct a toilet in his land. In this regard the petitioner had already given a representation to the respondents 1 to 3 on 11.03.2025. However, the same has not been considered by them. Hence, the present Writ Petition.

3. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents 1 to 3 on instructions submitted that as the dispute between the parties is civil in nature, police protection has not be given and hence, prayed for dismissal of this Writ Petition.



4. At the outset, this Court is of the view, such a protection cannot be granted particularly, when there is rival claim by the other side. The practice of granting blanket police protection particularly, in respect of immovable property without establishing title leads to serious consequences. In this aspect, the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***"PR.Muralidharan and others Vs.Swami Dharmananda Theertha Padar"*** reported in ***2006 4 SCC*** has held as follows:

"...19.A Writ for "Police Protection" so-called, has only a limited scope, as when the Court is approached for protection of rights declared by a decree or by an order passed by a civil Court. It cannot be extended to cases where rights have not been determined either finally by the civil Court or, at least at an interlocutory stage in an unambiguous manner, and then too in furtherance of the decree or order."

Even as per the submissions of the learned counsel for the petitioner, there is a civil dispute between the parties. In such view of the matter, there shall not be any blanket Order for police protection.

5. It is further relevant to note that the petitioner along with others had already filed a Writ Petition in 20577 of 2022 and this Court by an Order dated 12.06.2024 had dismissed the Writ Petition and directed the parties to approach



the Civil Court to establish their rights and not filing a petition under section 482

of Cr.P.C. Once again filing a petition under section 482 of Cr.P.C. is nothing

but abuse of process of law. Hence, I do not find any merits in this petition.

6. Accordingly, this Writ Petition is dismissed.

21-08-2025

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

vrc

To

1. The Superintendent Of Police,
Krishnagiri District.

2. The Deputy Superintendent Of Police,
Anchetty Circle And Taluk, Krishnagiri
District.

3. The Inspector Of Police,
Anchetty Police Station, Krishnagiri
District.



WEB COPY

WP No. 10890 of 2024



N.SATHISH KUMAR J.

vrc

WP No. 10890 of 2024

21-08-2025