



WEB COPY



Cont.P.No.2150 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 30.07.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S.RAMESH

and

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.LAKSHMINARAYANAN

Cont.P.No.2150 of 2025

Praveen Rajagopal

.. Petitioner

Vs.

Pravin Rajesh,
The Inspector of Police,
J8, Neelangarai Police Station.

.. Respondent

Prayer: Contempt Petition filed under Section 10 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, praying to punish the respondent for disobeying the order passed by the District Munsif Cum Judicial Magistrate, Shollinganallur, on 02.12.2024 in CrI.M.P.No.925 of 2024.

For Petitioner : Mr.Guru Dhananjay

For Respondent : Mr.E.Raj Thilak
Additional Public Prosecutor



Cont.P.No.2150 of 2025

ORDER

WEB COPY

(Order of the Court was made by *M.S.RAMESH, J.*)

On the application made by the petitioner under Section 210 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, the learned District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Sholinganallur, had passed orders in the C.M.P.No.925 of 2024 dated 02.12.2024, directing the respondent Police to register and investigate the petitioner's complaint as per the guidelines of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Lalitha Kunari case and investigate the matter and file a final report in two weeks. Alleging disobedience, this contempt petition has been filed.

2.In our view, the direction to the respondent to follow the guidelines in Lalitha Kumari's case will not amount to a positive direction for registering the complaint and the respondent would be at liberty to close the complaint when cognizable offence is not made out. In the instant case, the respondent police had filed an affidavit dated 30.07.2025, claiming that the petitioner's complaint was enquired and closed and the closure report has also been filed before the District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate's Court, through filing No.1215 of 2025



Cont.P.No.2150 of 2025

dated 01.07.2025. However, we find that the closure report has not been filed within two weeks time stipulated by the learned District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate. Though there is a disobedience in not adhering to the time limit prescribed by the learned District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, the disobedience may not be wilful in nature.

3.In the light of these developments, we are of the view that there is no wilful disobedience of the order of the Court. Accordingly, the contempt petition is closed with liberty to the petitioner to challenge the closure report in a manner known to law.

(M.S.R., J)

(V.L.N., J)

30.07.2025

krk

Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No
Neutral Citation : Yes / No



WEB COPY



Cont.P.No.2150 of 2025

M.S.RAMESH, J.
and

V.LAKSHMINARAYANAN, J.

krk

Cont.P.No.2150 of 2025

30.07.2025