



W.P(MD)No.6272 of 2025

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 11.03.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.DHANABAL

W.P(MD)No.6272 of 2025

S.Dassprakash

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Superintendent of Police,
Virudhunagar District-626 001.

2.The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Tiruchuli Sub Division,
Tiruchuli-626 129.

3.The Inspector of Police,
Tiruchuli Police Station,
Tiruchuli-626 129.

4.Sundaravadivel

5.R.Chandrasekaran

6.The Branch Manager,
Indian Overseas Bank,
Thiruchuli-626 129.

... Respondents

Prayer : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this Court to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the



W.P(MD)No.6272 of 2025

WEB COPY

respondents 1 to 3 to conduct fair enquiry upon the petitioner's representation, dated 13.11.2024 in accordance with law and pass such further or other orders as this Court.

For Petitioner : Mr.G.Dharmaraj
For R-1 to R-3 : Mr.R.M.Anbunithi
Additional Public Prosecutor
For R-6 : Mr.N.Dilip Kumar
Standing Counsel

ORDER

The present petition has been filed for issuance of Writ of Mandamus directing the respondents 1 to 3 to conduct fair enquiry upon the petitioner's representation, dated 13.11.2024 in accordance with law.

2. The learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner lodged a complaint before the third respondent as against the private respondents and they have not taken any action. Therefore, the petitioner sent a representation, dated 13.11.2024 and the same has not been considered. Hence, the petitioner filed this petition.



W.P(MD)No.6272 of 2025

WEB COPY

3. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the official respondents would submit that already the representation of the petitioner was considered and the same was closed after enquiry. Since there is a dispute in respect of the administration of Society and the parties were advised to approach the civil Court for seeking appropriate remedy and hence, nothing survives for further adjudication in this matter.

4. The learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner in reply would submit that no enquiry was conducted and no summon was issued to the petitioner. Without enquiry, they closed the petition. However, today the copy of the closure report is served to the petitioner.

5. Since the prayer of the petitioner is to consider the representation and the same was already considered and closed, it is for the petitioner to challenge the same in the manner known to law, if he is aggrieved.



W.P(MD)No.6272 of 2025

WEB COPY

6. In view of the same, preserving the liberty of the petitioner to challenge the closure report in the manner known to law, this writ petition stands closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

11.03.2025

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes
BTR

To

- 1.The Superintendent of Police,
Virudhunagar District-626 001.
- 2.The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Tiruchuli Sub Division,
Tiruchuli-626 129.
- 3.The Inspector of Police,
Tiruchuli Police Station,
Tiruchuli-626 129.
- 4.The Branch Manager,
Indian Overseas Bank,
Thiruchuli-626 129.



WEB COPY



W.P(MD)No.6272 of 2025

P.DHANABAL, J.

BTR

W.P(MD)No.6272 of 2025

11.03.2025