



W.P.(CrI)No.348 of 2025

WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 22.07.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P.VELMURUGAN

W.P.(CrI).No.348 of 2025 and
WPMP (CrI.)Nos.160, 162 and 163 of 2025

1. J.Elumalai
2. E.Pattammal

...Petitioners

Vs.

1. The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Office of Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Maduranthakam, Chengalpet District.
2. The Inspector of Police,
G-4 Cheyyur Police Station,
Cheyyur Taluk, Chengalpattu District.
3. Meghala
The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Office of Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Maduranthakam, Chengalpet District.
4. Babu
The Inspector of Police,
G-4 Cheyyur Police Station,
Cheyyur Taluk, Chengalpattu District.

5. Ganesan

..Respondents



W.P.(CrI)No.348 of 2025

WEB COPY

Prayer : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, 1950, praying for issuance of Writ of Certiorari to call for the records relating to proceedings of the impugned notice dated 09.06.2025 issued by the second respondent herein and quash the same.

For Petitioners : Mr.R.Ragavendran

For Respondents : Dr.C.E.Pratap,
Govt. Advocate (CrI.Side)
for R1 and R2

ORDER

This Writ Petition has been filed seeking to quash the impugned notice dated 09.06.2025 issued by the second respondent herein.

2 Learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that there is civil dispute between the parties and civil suit is also pending before the Civil Court. The respondent police without considering the above fact, issued summons on the petitioners. Earlier the petitioners also appeared before them, but instead of passing final orders, they are again and again issuing summons for appearance. Therefore the present impugned summon



W.P.(CrI)No.348 of 2025

has to be quashed.
WEB COPY

3 Learned Government Advocate (CrI.Side) for the respondents 1 and 2 would submit that based on the complaint given by the private respondent, the second respondent police issued summons on the petitioners for enquiry.

4 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned Government Advocate (CrI.Side) for the respondents 1 and 2 and perused the materials available on record.

5 Once the respondent police received complaint, it is the duty of the Station House Officer to conduct enquiry and proceed further. Like wise, once the general public received summon from the police, it is their bounden duty to appear before the police and give reply for the same. In the present case, instead of responding the summons issued by the police by appearing before them, the petitioners approached this Court invoking



W.P.(CrI)No.348 of 2025

WEB COPY

Article 226 of Constitution of India seeking to quash the summons.

Therefore this Court is not inclined to grant the relief sought for by the petitioners.

6 However, the respondent police is directed to issue fresh summons to the petitioners and on receipt of the same, the petitioners are directed to appear before the police and co-operate for enquiry. Thereafter the respondent police is directed to conclude the enquiry and pass final orders as early as possible.

7 With the above directions, this Writ Petition shall stand disposed of. Consequently connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

22.07.2025

(1/2)

cgi
Speaking /Non-speaking order



W.P.(CrI)No.348 of 2025

WEB COPY

To

1. The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Office of Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Maduranthakam, Chengalpet District.
2. The Inspector of Police,
G-4 Cheyyur Police Station,
Cheyyur Taluk, Chengalpattu District.
3. The Public Prosecutor, Madras High Court.



WEB COPY



W.P.(CrI)No.348 of 2025

P.VELMURUGAN, J.

cgi

W.P.(CrI.)No.348 of 2025

22.07.2025