



Crl.O.P.(MD) No.4659 of 2025

WEB COPY BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 13.03.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.DHANABAL

CRL. OP(MD).No.4659 of 2025

1. Ramakrishnan

2. R. Bagirathi

3. Pradeep Kumar

... Petitioners

Vs.

1. The State of Tamil Nadu,
Represented by the Superintendent of Police,
Office of Superintendent of Police,
Virudhunagar District.

2. The Additional Superintendent of Police,
Collectorate Complex,
Virudhunagar District.

3. Sathees Narayanan

... Respondents

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS), to direct the 2nd respondent not to harass the petitioners in the name of enquiry.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD) No.4659 of 2025

For Petitioners : Mr.M.Alaudheen
For R-1 & R-2 : Mr.M.Sakthi Kumar
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)
For R-3 : Mr.M.Jagadees Pandian

ORDER

This petition has been filed by the petitioners to direct the 2nd respondent not to harass the petitioners in the name of enquiry.

2. According to the petitioners, there is a property dispute pending between the petitioners and the 3rd respondent. Due to the same, the 3rd respondent lodged a false complaint against the petitioners before the 2nd respondent police and the 2nd respondent taking advantage of the said complaint used to harass the petitioners. Therefore, they sent a representation dated 05.03.2025, but the same has not been considered. Hence this petition.

3. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondents no.1 and 2 would submit that the 3rd respondent lodged a complaint against the petitioners in respect of money transactions for purchase of the property through an agreement. Thereafter, an enquiry



Crl.O.P.(MD) No.4659 of 2025

was conducted and the complaint of the 3rd respondent was closed. The 2nd respondent called the petitioners for enquiry based on the complaint given by the 3rd respondent and they have not harassed the petitioner as alleged in the petition.

4. Since the prayer of the petitioner is not to harass the petitioners, this Court even without issuing notice to the 3rd respondent inclined to pass orders.

5. According to the petitioner, the 2nd respondent police have harassed the petitioner based on the complaint given by the 3rd respondent. The learned Government Advocate has denied the harassment as alleged by the petitioners. However, they admitted that based on the complaint given by the 3rd respondent, they called the petitioners for enquiry purpose and thereafter, the said complaint was closed. Therefore, recording the above said submission of the learned Government Advocate, this Criminal Original Petition is closed.

13.03.2025

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



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD) No.4659 of 2025

P.DHANABAL, J.

mac

To

1. The Superintendent of Police,
Office of Superintendent of Police,
Virudhunagar District.
2. The Additional Superintendent of Police,
Collectorate Complex,
Virudhunagar District.
3. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

Crl.O.P(MD)No.4659 of 2025

13.03.2025