



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 18-09-2025

WEB COPY

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE N. SATHISH KUMAR


WP CrI. No. 882 of 2025

1. P.Rajamanickam
S/o.Ponnusamy, Door.No.13-9,
Naatchangadu, Konganapuram,
Edappadi Taluk, Salem District - 637
102.

Appellant(s)

Vs

1. The Additional Director General of
Police,
DGP Office Complex, Mylapore,
Chennai - 600 004.
- 2.The Inspector General of Police, West
Zone,
Coimbatore.
- 3.The Deputy Inspector General of
Police,
Salem.
- 4.The Superintendent of Police,
Salem.
- 5.The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
District Crime Branch, Salem.



WEB COPY

6. The Inspector of Police,
District Crime Branch, Office of
Superintendent of Police, Salem.

7. Bharathi Mohan,
Inspector of Police, District Crime
Branch, Office of Superintendent of
Police, Salem.

8. V. Kandasamy
S/o. Venkatachalam, No.3/69,
Pattanapatti Kattuvalavu Pudur Village,
Sankari Taluk, Salem District - 637
102.

Respondent(s)

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under section 528 of BNSS to issue Writ, order or Direction specifically writ in the nature of Writ of Mandamus forbearing the respondents 5 to 7 from interfering with the civil dispute arising out of the agreement for sale and allied alleged transactions in the name of enquiry and not to harass Petitioner, in compliance with the circular of the 1st respondent dated 09.01.2024 and pass such further or other orders as this Honble Court.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Prabakar

For Respondents : Mr.R.Vinodhraj,
Government Advocate [CrI.Side] – R1 to R6

**ORDER**

WEB COPY

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed to forbearing the respondents 5 to 7 from interfering with the civil dispute arising out of the agreement for sale and allied alleged transactions in the name of enquiry and not to harass the petitioner, in compliance with the circular of the first respondent dated 09.01.2024.

2. It is the case of the petitioner that there is a registered agreement for sale between the petitioner and the eighth respondent. As the time stipulated in the agreement is over, notice has been issued. However, the eighth respondent, who had not come forward to perform the terms of the agreement, had lodged a complaint before the sixth respondent and the petitioner was also threatened to return the amount mentioned in the unregistered agreement and also harassing the petitioner to execute the document as per the agreement which had already been expired. Hence, the present petition has been filed seeking aforesaid relief.



WEB COPY

3. The learned Government Advocate [Criminal Side] appearing for the respondents 1 to 6 on instructions submitted that there are two agreements said to have been executed, out of which one agreement is a registered agreement and the other has been forged.

4. At the outset, this Court is of the view that, if at all one of the agreement is forged, forgery has to be established by sending the document to the Forensic Department and if forgery is made out, the petitioner may be prosecuted. As far as the registered agreement is concerned, the police have no role to interfere with the possession of the petitioner.

6. With the above observations, this Writ Petition is closed.

18-09-2025

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

vrc



WEB COPY

1. The Additional Director General of
Police,
DGP Office Complex, Mylapore,
Chennai - 600 004.

2. The Inspector General of Police, West
Zone,
Coimbatore.

3. The Deputy Inspector General of
Police,
Salem.

4. The Superintendent of Police,
Salem.

5. The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
District Crime Branch, Salem.

6. The Inspector of Police,
District Crime Branch, Office of
Superintendent of Police, Salem.

7. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY

WP CrI. No. 882 of 2025



N.SATHISH KUMAR J.

VRC

WP CrI. No. 882 of 2025

18-09-2025