



CrI.O.P.(MD)Nos.3245 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.3245 of 2025

Armstrong

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Superintendent of Police,
Superintendent Office,
Madurai District.

2. The Inspector of Police,
Chekkanurani Police Station,
Madurai District.

3. M.Sivasubramaniyan

... Respondents

PRAYER : Petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS 2023, to pass an order directing the 2nd respondent not to harass the petitioner under the guise of enquiry, based on the petitioner's representation dated 12.02.2025.



CrI.O.P.(MD)Nos.3245 of 2025

WEB COPY

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

ORDER

This criminal original petition has been filed seeking for a direction to the 2nd respondent not to harass the petitioner under the guise of enquiry, based on the petitioner's representation dated 12.02.2025.

2. According to the petitioner, he is an Engineer (PWD) and the third respondent is the contractor. Based on the false complaint given by the third respondent, due to the contract dispute, the second respondent is frequently calling the petitioner for enquiry. Infact, the third respondent already gave a complaint in the year 2022 and the same was enquired by the former Inspector of Police and the same was also closed. Again, the third respondent lodged a fresh complaint only to harass the petitioner. Therefore, the petitioner sent a representation to the second respondent on 12.02.2025. But the same has not been considered and hence, this petition has been filed.



CrI.O.P.(MD)Nos.3245 of 2025

WEB COPY

3. The learned Government Advocate appearing for the respondent police would submit that the third respondent lodged a complaint before the second respondent in the year 2022 and the same was closed after elaborate enquiry. However, again the third respondent lodged a complaint before the first respondent and the same was forwarded to the second respondent and therefore, the second respondent conducted an enquiry and the same is still pending. Only for the enquiry purpose, the second respondent called the petitioner. However, the petitioner has not appeared before the second respondent. The respondent police will complete the enquiry within one week in accordance with law.

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

5. Considering the limited scope of the relief sought for in this petition, this Court is inclined to pass orders, without even issuing notice to the third respondent. Considering the rival submission made on either side and also the



CrI.O.P.(MD)Nos.3245 of 2025

WEB COPY

2nd respondent lodged a complaint against the petitioner and the same is pending for enquiry and the police also assured to complete the enquiry within a week, recording the submission made by the learned Government Advocate, this criminal original petition is disposed of.

20.02.2025

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



CrI.O.P.(MD)Nos.3245 of 2025

WEB COPY

TO:-

1. The Superintendent of Police,
Superintendent Office,
Madurai District.
2. The Inspector of Police,
Chekkanurani Police Station,
Madurai District.
3. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



CrI.O.P.(MD)Nos.3245 of 2025

P.DHANABAL, J.

sm

Order made in
CrI.O.P.(MD)No.3245 of 2025

Dated:
20.02.2025