



CrI.O.P.(MD)Nos.3176 of 2025

WEB COPY BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 20.02.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE **MR.JUSTICE P.DHANABAL**

CrI.O.P.(MD)No.3176 of 2025

K.Murali

Vs.

... Petitioner

1. The Superintendent of Police,  
Sivagangai,  
Sivagangai District.

2. The Deputy Superintendent Of Police,  
Karaikudi, Sivagangai District.

3. Soma Sundaram

... Respondents

PRAYER : Petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS 2023, to direct the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent not to interfere in Civil Dispute in any manner in guise of enquiry.

For Petitioners : Mr.G.Mathavan

For Respondents : Mr.M.Sakthi Kumar (R1 & R2)  
Government Advocate



CrI.O.P.(MD)Nos.3176 of 2025

WEB COPY

## **ORDER**

This criminal original petition has been filed seeking for a direction to the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent not to interfere with the civil dispute in any manner in guise of enquiry.

2. According to the petitioner, there is a property dispute between the petitioner and the third respondent. While so, the third respondent lodged a false complaint before the second respondent. But the second respondent, without considering that this is civil dispute, is frequently calling the petitioner. Therefore, the petitioner filed this petition.

3. The learned Government Advocate appearing for the respondent police would submit that the respondents received the complaint from the third respondent and hence, they called the petitioner for enquiry. Instead of appearing for enquiry, the petitioner filed this petition. The respondents have to conduct enquiry and they will take action in accordance with law.



CrI.O.P.(MD)Nos.3176 of 2025

WEB COPY 4. The learned counsel appearing for the third respondent would submit that the petitioner by suppressing the legal heirs, forged the documents and also cheated the third respondent and hence, the third respondent lodged a complaint before the second respondent and the same is under enquiry.

5. At this juncture, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner pointed out that in this case, the Superintendent of Police, particularly appointed the second respondent to deal with the case and therefore, it is appropriate to direct the District Crime Branch, Sivagangai, to enquire with this matter and dispose of the same.

6. Heard the learned counsel on either side and perused the materials placed before this Court.

7. Considering the rival submissions made on either side and also considering the fact that the third respondent lodged a complaint against the petitioner and the same is also under enquiry by the second respondent, it is for



CrI.O.P.(MD)Nos.3176 of 2025

WEB COPY

the second respondent to consider the above said complaint and dispose of the same in accordance with law.

8. In view of the above, the second respondent is directed to complete the enquiry in accordance with law, within a period of one week from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. With this direction, this criminal original petition is disposed of.

**20.02.2025**

Neutral Citation : Yes / No  
Index : Yes / No  
sm



CrI.O.P.(MD)Nos.3176 of 2025

WEB COPY

TO:-

1. The Superintendent of Police,  
Sivagangai,  
Sivagangai District.
2. The Deputy Superintendent Of Police,  
Karaikudi, Sivagangai District.
3. The District Crime Branch, Sivagangai.
4. The Additional Public Prosecutor,  
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,  
Madurai.



WEB COPY



CrI.O.P.(MD)Nos.3176 of 2025

**P.DHANABAL, J.**

sm

Order made in  
**CrI.O.P.(MD)No.3176 of 2025**

Dated:  
**20.02.2025**