



Crl.O.P.No.20228 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated: 18.07.2025

Coram:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.VELMURUGAN

Crl.O.P.No.20228 of 2025

--

N.Sairam, S/o G.R.Natarajan,
Partner of G.R.Natarajan & Co.,
No.1, Jawaharlal Nehru Street,
T.Nagar, Chennai-600 017.

.. Petitioner

Vs.

The Inspector of Police (L & O),
F.3, Nungambakkam Police Station,
Chennai-600 034.

.. Respondent

Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 of the BNSS Act to set aside the order passed by the Inspector of Police, L & O, F.3 Police Station, Chennai, in Rc.No.906/JCOP (EZ) C.V/2025, dated 10.06.2025.

For petitioner : M/s.V.K.Sathiamurthy

For respondent: Mr.S.Vinoth Kumar, Govt. Advocate (Crl. Side)

ORDER

The petitioner has filed the present petition to set aside the order passed by the Inspector of Police, L & O, F.3 Police Station, Chennai, in Rc.No.906/JCOP (EZ) C.V/2025, dated 10.06.2025.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner's Car



Crl.O.P.No.20228 of 2025

bearing Registration No.TN-22-BD-2502 (Santro Blue Colour Car) was removed from the place where it was parked. According to the petitioner, one D.Chandra Regha and her husband, with mala-fide intention or without intimation, removed the Car and therefore, the petitioner has given a complaint before the respondent-Police and the respondent-Police had not taken any action.

3. In this petition, this Court finds that the said D.Chandra Regha and her husband were trespassers and the respondent-Police had not taken any action and further, they went to the extent of filing closure report, which is against law.

4. Learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondent submitted that there was dispute regarding the car parking and therefore, soon after receiving the petition, the respondent-Police found out the car and intimated the same through him and the petitioner-Company refused to take back the car.

5. However, the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the respondent/Police never intimated them about the car and therefore, the present petition is filed to set aside the closure report filed by the respondent.

6. Since there is civil dispute between the parties, and that a civil suit is also pending between the parties and there is also a dispute regarding the amenities and also whether the petitioner trespassed or not between the rightful owner of the properties, can be decided only by the competent Civil Court and by



Crl.O.P.No.20228 of 2025

the Police. However, the respondent-Police admitted that the said car was removed from the place where the petitioner was parking the car. The respondent stated that the car was found some-where-else and therefore, the respondent is hereby directed to intimate the petitioner as to where the car has been found and kept it.

7. With the above direction, this petition is disposed of. The petitioner-Company is at liberty to work out their remedy in the manner known to law regarding the car parking and other amenities.

18.07.2025

CS

To

1. The Inspector of Police (L & O),
F.3, Nungambakkam Police Station,
Chennai-600 034.
2. The Public Prosecutor, High Court, Madras.

Page No.3/4



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.20228 of 2025

P.VELMURUGAN, J

CS

Crl.O.P.No.20228 of 2025

18.07.2025

Page No.4/4