



CrI.O.P.(MD)Nos.2971 of 2025

WEB COPY BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 18.02.2025

CORAM:

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

CrI.O.P.(MD)No.2971 of 2025

Kannan

Vs.

... Petitioner

1. The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep by the Superintendent of Police,
Madurai District.
2. The Deputy Superintendent Of Police,
Thirumangalam, Madurai District.
3. The Sub Inspector of Police,
Austinpatti Police Station,
Madurai District.
4. C.Thangaraj

... Respondents

PRAYER : Petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS 2023, to direct the 3rd respondent not to harass the Petitioner and his family members on the basis of the petitioner's representation dt.11.02.2025.



CrI.O.P.(MD)Nos.2971 of 2025

WEB COPY

For Petitioner : Mr.K.Arunraj
For Respondents : Mr.M.Sakthi Kumar (R1 to R3)
Government Advocate
Mr.L.Prabhu (R4)

ORDER

This criminal original petition has been filed seeking for a direction to the 3rd respondent not to harass the petitioner and his family members on the basis of the petitioner's representation dated 11.02.2025.

2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner has purchased the property in S.Nos.413/4, 413/6 & 413/7 measuring to total extent of 9 acres 20 cents situated at Karadikkal Vilalge, Thirumangalam Taluk, Madurai District, through the sale deed dated 31.10.2011 and thereafter, he converted the said land into plots and borrowed money from one Murugan, who is the brother of the fourth respondent. Thereafter, the petitioner executed a general power of attorney in favour of the said Murugan on 09.05.2014 in respect of said plots. In the meanwhile, the petitioner sold the plots to some persons. While so, the said Murugan also executed a sale deed, without any



CrI.O.P.(MD)Nos.2971 of 2025

WEB COPY

consideration to the petitioner, in favour of his wife and father-in-law and also some other third parties. The said Murugan also executed the sale agreement with the fourth respondent in respect of 111 plots without giving money to the petitioner. Therefore, the petitioner cancelled the said power of attorney deed executed in favour of Murugan.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would further submit that the fourth respondent filed a suit in O.S.No.64 of 2019 seeking for specific performance against the said Murugan and others before the IV Additional District Judge, Madurai, and the said suit was withdrawn, based on the compromise entered into between the parties. In the meantime, the respondent police called the petitioner for enquiry on the basis of the complaint given by the fourth respondent and he has also appeared and the third respondent police threatened the petitioner to settle the matter. The subject matter is purely civil in nature. However, the respondent police threatened the petitioner to settle the matter. Therefore, the petitioner sent a representation dated 11.12.2025. But the same has not been considered till date. Hence, this petition came to be filed.



CrI.O.P.(MD)Nos.2971 of 2025

WEB COPY

4. The learned counsel appearing for the fourth respondent would submit that the petitioner cheated the fourth respondent and he has already executed power of attorney deed in favour of one Murugan and the said Murugan executed the sale agreement in respect of the subject properties and thereafter, he filed a suit in O.S.No.64 of 2019 on the file of the IV Additional District Judge, Madurai, and the same was withdrawn, based on the compromise entered into between the parties. Thereafter, the petitioner lodged a complaint and the same is under enquiry. Therefore, he prayed for dismissal of this petition.

5. The learned Government Advocate appearing for the official respondents, would submit that based on the complaint given by fourth respondent, the respondent police made an enquiry and they have called the petitioner for enquiry. In the meantime, the petitioner sent a representation dated 11.02.2025 and the respondents will also consider the representation of the petitioner and complete the enquiry within a period of one week.



CrI.O.P.(MD)Nos.2971 of 2025

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

7. Since the prayer is as against the third respondent not to harass the petitioner and also recording the submission made by the learned Government Advocate appearing for the official respondents that only based on the complaint given by the fourth respondent, the respondent police called the petitioner for enquiry and the representation of the petitioner is also under consideration, this Court directs the third respondent to complete the enquiry within one week from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

8. With the above direction, this criminal original petition is disposed of.

18.02.2025

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

5/6



WEB COPY



CrI.O.P.(MD)Nos.2971 of 2025

P.DHANABAL, J.

sm

TO:-

1. The Superintendent of Police,
Madurai District.
2. The Deputy Superintendent Of Police,
Thirumangalam,
Madurai District.
3. The Sub Inspector of Police,
Austinpatti Police Station,
Madurai District.
4. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

Order made in
CrI.O.P.(MD)No.2971 of 2025

Dated:
18.02.2025