



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 04.11.2025

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA

W.P.Crl.No.1241 of 2025

G.Revathi

...Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Commissioner of Police,
Tambaram, Karapakkam,
Sholinganallur, Chennai – 600 111.

2. The Inspector of Police,
T14 Mangadu Police Station,
Mangadu, Chennai – 600 112.

3. The Inspector of Police,
T-5, Kundrathur Police Station,
Kundrathur, Chennai – 600 065.

...Respondents

Writ Petition (Criminal) filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a Writ of Mandamus directing the first respondent to register a First Information Report (FIR) and investigate the petitioner's complaint lodged on 11.07.2025 within the time frame fixed by this Hon'ble Court.

For Petitioner : Mr.K.Seetha Ram

For Respondents : Mr.R.Vinothraja, GA (Crl. Side)



ORDER

WEB COPY

This writ petition (criminal) has been filed seeking to direct the first respondent to register an FIR and investigate the petitioner's complaint lodged on 11.07.2025.

2. Mr.R.Vinothraja, learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) takes notice on behalf of the respondents. In view of the consent expressed by the learned counsel on either side, this writ petition (criminal) is taken up for final disposal at the admission stage itself.

3. The case of the petitioner is as follows:

3.1. When the petitioner was looking for a suitable land for building a temple in and around Madipakkam, one Laitha Mahadevan, who claimed herself to be an influential politician, along with one Prem, who claimed himself to be a Sub-Inspector of Police, Kundrathur approached the petitioner and suggested that a land is available for purchase in Tarapakkam Village for a sum of Rs.70,00,000/- and introduced the petitioner to one Chokalingam, who claimed himself to be the Councillor of Tarapakkam and a real estate person, who in turn, introduced them to one Pakiriswamy, who



claimed to be having a land for 99 years lease from the HR & CE Department, which is comprised in S.No.58 measuring an extent of 1 acre and 5 cents.

3.2. Later, the petitioner and others met one Venkatesan, who claimed to be the Accountant for the temples located in that area under the control of the HR & CE Department and he submitted that upon settling the pasali balance in the name of the said Pakiriswamy and upon receipt of written agreement from the said Pakiriswamy, the lease can be changed from the name of the said Pakiriswamy.

3.3. Believing the same, the petitioner paid a sum of Rs.1,50,000/- to the said Pakiriswamy and Rs.12,00,000/- to the said Laitha Mahadevan and Prem. That apart, the petitioner and 48 others, joining together, paid a sum of Rs.15,00,000/- to the said Pakiriswamy for getting the agreement and also paid a sum of Rs.3,00,000/- in favour of the said Chockalingam towards cleaning of the land. The petitioner and others further paid the full pasali outstanding of Rs.8,01,868/- to the said Venkatesan for which bill was issued.



WEB COPY

W.P.Crl.No.1241 of 2



3.4. However, thereafter, the petitioner came to know about the fraud committed by the abovesaid persons and that the bills given by the said Venkatesan are fake.

3.5. Therefore, the petitioner filed a writ petition before this Court in W.P.No.24197 of 2025 and this Court, *vide* order dated 19.07.2025 directed the Executive Engineer, Arulmighu Kailasanathar Temple, Thoraipakkam, Chennai, to execute the lease deed in favour of the petitioner for the purpose of utilising the same for agricultural activities. In the mean time, the petitioner also made a complaint before the first respondent on 11.07.2025. However, till date, no action has been taken by the first respondent on the complaint made by the petitioner. Hence, the present writ petition (criminal) has been filed before this Court seeking appropriate direction.

4. Though very many grounds have been raised, the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that, it would suffice, if this Court issues a direction to the first respondent to consider the petitioner's complaint dated



11.07.2025 and to consequently, register an First Information Report (FIR) and investigate the matter in accordance with law.

5. Learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondents submitted that, without exhausting the remedy available under the provision of the BNSS, the petitioner has straightaway approached this Court by way of filing this writ petition and hence, the same is not maintainable. However, he fairly submitted that the petitioner's complaint dated 11.07.2025 has been forwarded to the third respondent under Current Paper No.600 of 2025 and that the third respondent will complete the enquiry within a stipulated time.

6. In view of the aforesaid submissions, this Court, without going into the merits of the case, directs the third respondent to conduct an enquiry on the petitioner's complaint dated 11.07.2025 in C.P.No.600 of 2025 and complete the same, within a period of four (4) weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.



WEB COPY

W.P.Crl.No.1241 of 2



7. With the above direction, this writ petition (criminal) stands disposed of. No costs.

04.11.2025

skt

Index : Yes/No
Speaking order : Yes/No
NCC : Yes/No

To:

1. The Commissioner of Police,
Tambaram, Karapakkam,
Sholinganallur, Chennai – 600 111.
2. The Inspector of Police,
T14 Mangadu Police Station,
Mangadu, Chennai – 600 112.
3. The Inspector of Police,
T-5, Kundrathur Police Station,
Kundrathur, Chennai – 600 065.
4. The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court.



WEB COPY



W.P.Crl.No.1241 of 2

A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.

skt

W.P.Crl.No.1241 of 2025

04.11.2025