



W.P.(MD) No.3717 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED : 12.02.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.DHANABAL

W.P(MD)No.3717 of 2025

M.Abdul Jabbar

... Petitioner

Vs

1. The Superintendent of Police,
Office of the Superintendent of Police,
Thanjavur District.

2. The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Office of the Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Pattukotai,
Thanjavur District.

3. The Inspector of Police,
Athiramapattinam Police Station,
Thanjavur District.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, for issuance of Writ of Mandamus, to direct the respondent Nos.2 and 3 to consider the petitioner's representation dated 05.11.2024 and to conduct enquiry and take appropriate action on the complaint in C.S.R No.859 of 2024 on the file of the 3rd respondent within the time stipulated by this Honourable Court.



W.P.(MD) No.3717 of 2025

For Petitioner : Mr.I.Pinaygash

For Respondent :

For R1 to R2 : Mr.R.M.Anbunithi

Additional Public Prosecutor (Crl. Side)

ORDER

This writ petition is filed by the petitioner to direct the respondents no.2 and 3 to consider the representation dated 05.11.2024 to conduct enquiry and take appropriate action on the complaint in C.S.R No.859 of 2024.

2. According to the petitioner, he lodged a complaint as against one Selvaraj and thereafter, the 3rd respondent gave a C.S.R.No.859 of 2024, but no steps have been taken. Therefore, he filed this petition.

3. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondents would submit that the representation of the petitioner dated 05.11.2024 was forwarded to the 3rd respondent and the same was closed on 07.12.2024 as both parties compromised. The dispute in respect of lands, the parties can approach the Civil Court.



W.P.(MD) No.3717 of 2025

WEB COPY

4. In reply, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that there is no property dispute between the parties, the complaint is in respect of trespass and life threats made by the accused. Therefore, without conducting enquiry, they closed the complaint.

5. Heard both sides and perused the materials on record.

6. The prayer of the petitioner is that the petitioner lodged complaint on 05.11.2024 but the respondents have not considered his complaint, hence to consider the representation dated 05.11.2024 he filed this petition. According to the 3rd respondent, the representation was already enquired and same was closed. Therefore, there is nothing survives for further adjudication since the prayer of the petitioner is already considered by the respondents. If at all the petitioner aggrieved by the order of the respondents, he can challenge the same in the manner known to law.

7. With the above said observations, this writ petition is dismissed and it is open to the petitioner to approach the 3rd respondent with



W.P.(MD) No.3717 of 2025

available materials. No costs.

WEB COPY

12.02.2025

Internet :Yes
Index :Yes/No
NCC :Yes/No
mac



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD) No.3717 of 2025

P.DHANABAL, J.

mac

To

1. The Superintendent of Police,
Office of the Superintendent of Police,
Thanjavur District.
2. The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Office of the Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Pattukotai,
Thanjavur District.
3. The Inspector of Police,
Athiramapattinam Police Station,
Thanjavur District
4. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

W.P(MD)No.3717 of 2025

12.02.2025