



Crl.O.P(MD)No.5016 of 2025

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 19.03.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.DHANABAL

Crl.O.P(MD)No.5016 of 2025

K.Rajkannan

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The State of Tamil Nadu,  
Represented by its,  
The Superintendent of Police,  
Dindigul,  
Dindigul District.

2.The Inspector of Police,  
Sempatti Police Station,  
Dindigul District.

3.Kannathasan

... Respondents

**Prayer** : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 of B.N.S.S., 2023, to direct the second respondent not to harass the petitioner under the guise of enquiry by considering the petitioner's representation, dated 10.03.2025.

For Petitioner : Mr.C.Susikumar  
For R-1 & R-2 : Mr.M.Sakthi Kumar  
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)



Crl.O.P(MD)No.5016 of 2025

WEB COPY

## **ORDER**

This petition has been filed by the petitioner to direct the second respondent not to harass the petitioner under the guise of enquiry by considering the petitioner's representation, dated 10.03.2025.

2. According to the petitioner, the third respondent, who is the father-in-law of the petitioner lodged a complaint before the second respondent for the property dispute. In fact the petitioner purchased the property from the third respondent through sale deed and thereafter, due to escalation of price, now the third respondent lodged a complaint before the second respondent. Based on the complaint, the second respondent used to harass the petitioner by interfering the civil dispute.

3. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the official respondents would submit that there is a dispute between the petitioner and the third respondent. The third respondent is none other than the father-in-law of the petitioner and there is a dispute between them in respect of purchase of property. Therefore, the third respondent lodged a complaint and based on



**Crl.O.P(MD)No.5016 of 2025**

WEB COPY

the complaint, the second respondent called the petitioner for enquiry. Apart from that they have not harassed the petitioner. However, the enquiry is still pending. They will complete the enquiry along with the representation of the petitioner, dated 10.03.2025 within a week.

4. Since the prayer of the petitioner is not to harass the petitioner and the second respondent also denied the alleged harassment and based on the complaint given by the third respondent, they called the petitioner for enquiry and also the learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the official respondents assured to complete the enquiry within a week, this Court recording the above said submission directs the second respondent to consider the representation of the petitioner, dated 10.03.2025 along with the petition of the third respondent and dispose of the same, within a period of one (1) week from the date of this order. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition stands disposed of.

**19.03.2025**

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



**Crl.O.P(MD)No.5016 of 2025**

WEB COPY To

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



WEB COPY



**Crl.O.P(MD)No.5016 of 2025**

**P.DHANABAL, J.**

BTR

**Crl.O.P(MD)No.5016 of 2025**

**19.03.2025**