



W.P(MD) No.6992 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED : 17.03.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.DHANABAL

W.P(MD) No.6992 of 2025

Chithra

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. State Represented by Its
The Commissioner of Police,
Madurai City.

2. The Inspector of Police,
Koodal Pudur Police Station,
Madurai.

3. Durga Devi

... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India,
for issuance of Writ of Mandamus, directing 1st and 2nd respondents to
take appropriate action and dispose the representation dated 22.01.2025.


For Petitioner : Mr.P.Praveenkumar

For R-1 & R-2 : Mr.R.M.Anbunithi

Additional Public Prosecutor (Crl. Side)

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed by the petitioner to direct
respondents no.1 and 2 to take appropriate action and dispose the




W.P(MD) No.6992 of 2025

representation dated 22.01.2025.

WEB COPY

2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner purchased a property in S.F.No. 42/3B2 at Karisalkulam, Vilangudi Village, Madurai North Taluk. The 3rd respondent and her husband Selvaganesh assisted the petitioner in purchasing the plot for negotiation of price. While so, the father of the petitioner has allowed the 3rd respondent and her husband to establish a bakery in front of the petitioner's Hotel and the same were running successfully. Meanwhile, since the petitioner is residing in Kerala, the plot purchased by the petitioner was also entrusted to the 3rd respondent to take care of the property. Due to misunderstanding between the petitioner's father and the 3rd respondent, they have insisted the 3rd respondent to remove the bakery and vacate the premises. But, the 3rd respondent and her husband had demanded money and the petitioner's father has also paid a sum of Rs.6,00,000/- as compensation. Thereafter, they vacated the premises and handed over the possession of the property to the father of the petitioner. Now, the husband of the 3rd respondent is refusing to return the original documents entrusted to him for the mutation of revenue records, and the 3rd respondent demanding a sum of Rs.



W.P(MD) No.6992 of 2025

8,00,000/- to return the original documents. Therefore, the petitioner


lodge a detailed complaint to the respondents no. 1 and 2 on 22.01.2025,

but the same has not been considered. Hence the petition.

3. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondents no.1 and 2 would submit that the petitioner sent a representation dated 22.01.2025 and thereafter, not appeared for enquiry since he is residing in Kerala. If the petitioner appears for enquiry, they will conduct an enquiry and dispose of the same within one week.

4. Considering the limited prayer sought for in the petitioner, this Court even without issuing notice to the private respondent inclined to pass orders.

5. According to the petitioner, he sent a representation dated 22.01.2025 and the same has not been considered. According to the 2nd respondent, they have received the representation of the petitioner and thereafter, the petitioner did not appear for enquiry. Therefore, recording the submission of the 2nd respondent, this Court directs the petitioner to



W.P(MD) No.6992 of 2025

appear before the 2nd respondent on 21.03.2025 and thereafter, the 2nd respondent is directed to take necessary action and dispose of the petitioner's representation, dated 22.01.2025 in accordance with law within a period of one week.

6. With the above said observations and directions, this writ petition is disposed of. No costs.

17.03.2025

NCC : Yes/No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No
Mac



W.P(MD) No.6992 of 2025

WEB COPY

To

1. The Commissioner of Police,
Madurai City.
2. The Inspector of Police,
Koodal Pudur Police Station,
Madurai.
3. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



W.P(MD) No.6992 of 2025

P.DHANABAL, J.

Mac

W.P(MD) No.6992 of 2025

17.03.2025