



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.1829 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED :28.02.2025

CORAM :

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.1829 of 2025

1. Senthil Vel
2. Boopathi Raja
3. Poovansha
4. Susila Sha
5. Manikandan
6. Manjula
7. M.Premkumar
8. M.Kubendran

... Petitioners

Vs.

1. The State of Tamil Nadu,
Represented by the Commissioner of Police,
Madurai City,
Madurai..

2. The State of Tamil Nadu,
Represented by the Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch-III,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
Madurai District,
Madurai.

3. P.Ramachandran

... Respondents

Prayer : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 of Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to direct the 1st respondent to instruct the
2nd respondent not to harass the petitioner repeatedly by way of appearing



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.1829 of 2025

before the 2nd respondent police, under the guise of enquiry without due process of law.

For petitioners : Mr.S.Vashik Ali
for Mr.K.Kushik Nivas

For R-1 & R2 : Mr.K.Sakthi Kumar
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

For R-3 : No Appearance

ORDER

This petition has been filed by the petitioners to direct the 1st respondent to instruct the 2nd respondent police not to harass the petitioners under the guise of enquiry.

2. According to the petitioners, the 3rd respondent lodged a complaint as against the petitioners and thereafter, the 3rd respondent has obtained an order from this Court in W.P.(MD)No.4083 of 2025 dated 17.02.2025 and this Court passed the order to dispose of the representation of the 3rd respondent herein after issuing notice to the private respondents and the petitioner and conclude the enquiry within a period of two weeks. Taking advantage of the same, the 2nd respondent police have issued summon and they have also appeared before the 2nd respondent police for enquiry, but the 2nd respondent police have insisted the petitioners to hand over the possession of the property to the 3rd respondent. Therefore, they have filed

this petition.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.1829 of 2025

3. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondents no.1 to 2 would submit that this Court directed the 2nd respondent police to complete the enquiry based on the complaint given by the 3rd respondent and thereby, they issued summon to the petitioners for enquiry, but, only one person appeared for enquiry. They did not insisted the petitioners to hand over the possession of the property and they only called for enquiry based on the order of this Court.

4. The prayer of the petitioners is only not to harass the petitioners and the 2nd respondent police have also denied the allegations levelled against them. Therefore, considering the limited prayer sought for in this petition, this Court without issuing notice to the 3rd respondent inclined to dispose of the petition by recording the above said submission of the 2nd respondent police that they have not harassed the petitioners and not insisted to hand over the possession of the property and they have called the petitioners for enquiry purpose only, this criminal original petition is closed.

28.02.2025

NCC : Yes / No

Index : Yes / No

Internet : Yes

Mac



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.1829 of 2025

P. DHANABAL, J.,

Mac

Copy to

1. The Commissioner of Police,
Madurai City,
Madurai..
2. The Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch-III,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
Madurai District,
Madurai.
3. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.1829 of 2025

28.02.2025