



W.P.(CrL.) No.658 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

WEB COPY

Dated: 25.08.2025

Coram:

THE HONOURABLE Mr.JUSTICE N.SATHISH KUMAR

W.P.(CrL.)No.658 of 2025 &
WPMP CrL.No.304 of 2025

J.Sathyanarayanan

...Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Superintendent of Police,
Chengalpattu District, Chengalpattu

2. The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
District Crime Branch,
Chengalpattu District, Chengalpattu

3. Thabitha Chellamma

...Respondents

Prayer:

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 Constitution of India for issuance of a Writ of Mandamus forbearing the 1st and 2nd respondents from interfering with the civil dispute between the petitioner and the 3rd respondent arising out of the Development Agreement dated 25.10.2021 and the Deed of General Power of Attorney dated 27.10.2021 registered on the file of the SRO Tiruporur vide Doc.No.18062/2021.

For Petitioner

: Mr.V.Chandrasekaran for
Mr.M.Premkumar

For Respondents

: Mr.R.Vinothraja for R1 and R2
Government Advocate (CrL.Side)
Mr.E.Senthilkumar for R3

ORDER



W.P.(Crl.) No.658 of 2025

WEB COPY

The present petition has been filed forbearing the respondents 1 and 2 from interfering with the civil dispute between the petitioner and the 3rd respondent arising out of Development Agreement dated 25.10.2021 and Deed of General Power of Attorney dated 27.10.2021.

2. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondents 1 and 2 and the learned counsel for the 3rd respondent and perused the documents placed on record.

3. The case of the petitioner is that there is a Development Agreement between the parties and a dispute had already arose between the parties with regard to certain aspects. Further, in the Development Agreement itself, there is a clause for Arbitration, in case of any dispute. However, now the complaint is given by the 3rd respondent before the police and police is interfering with the affairs of the petitioner.

4. It is the contention of the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side)



W.P.(Crl.) No.658 of 2025

appearing for the respondents 1 and 2 that the parties themselves are agreeing

to settle the dispute in current paper and hence they kept the matter pending.

However, he submitted that they would close the complaint.

5. The learned counsel for the 3rd respondent would submit that power of attorney dated 26.10.2021 executed between themselves appointing the petitioner as their lawful attorney clearly indicated that in all the sales, principal should be made as witness, which has not been made. That apart, having sent the deducted TDS, the amount has not been paid, therefore it is a clear case of fraud. According to 3rd respondent, sale price has not been paid.

6. Therefore, this Court is of the view that the grievance of the petitioner is with regard to the contractual terms between the parties, if the 3rd respondent is really of the view that sale consideration has not been paid, remedy lies elsewhere, still there is a Power of attorney alive without taking any steps. Further, as of now, the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondents 1 and 2 submitted that they are also closing the complaint.

7. In such view of the matter, it is for parties to approach the civil court or



W.P.(Crl.) No.658 of 2025

arbitration, as per the contract. Accordingly, the present petition stands

disposed of. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

25.08.2025

Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No
Speaking Order / Non Speaking Order
ssd

To

1. The Superintendent of Police,
Chengalpattu District, Chengalpattu
2. The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
District Crime Branch,
Chengalpattu District, Chengalpattu

N.SATHISH KUMAR, J.



WEB COPY



W.P.(Crl.) No.658 of 2025

ssd

W.P.(Crl.)No.658 of 2025

25.08.2025