



Crl.O.P(MD)No.5124 of 2025

WEB COPY BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 20.03.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.DHANABAL

Crl.O.P(MD)No.5124 of 2025

Vadivel

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The superintendent of Police,
Trichy District,
Trichy.

2.The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Manaparai,
Trichy District.

3.Mega

... Respondents

Prayer : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 of B.N.S.S., 2023, to direct the second respondent's police to not to harass the petitioner on the compliant of the third respondent under the guise of enquiry and to pass any order or orders as this Court.

For Petitioner : Mr.T.A.Ebenezer



Crl.O.P(MD)No.5124 of 2025

WEB COPY


For R-1 & R-2 : Mr.M.Sakthi kumar
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

ORDER

This petition has been filed by the petitioner to direct the second respondent police to not to harass the petitioner on the complaint of the third respondent under the guise of enquiry.

2. According to the petitioner, the third respondent is the wife of the petitioner and there is a matrimonial dispute pending between them. Already the petitioner filed H.M.O.P.No.22 of 2025 on the file of the Sub Court, Manaparai. While so, the third respondent lodged a false complaint against the petitioner before the second respondent. Based on the same, the second respondent frequently called the petitioner for enquiry and they instructed to settle the matter. Therefore, the petitioner filed this petition.

3. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the official respondents would submit that there is a family dispute pending between the petitioner and the third respondent. While so, the third respondent



Crl.O.P(MD)No.5124 of 2025

lodged a complaint against the petitioner alleging that the belongings of the third respondent are under the custody of the petitioner and at the time of enquiry, the petitioner assured to return the belongings of the third respondent to her and also he gave written undertaking, dated 16.03.2025. Based on that undertaking, the complaint was closed. Now the petitioner filed this petition by suppressing all the facts. The second respondent has not harassed the petitioner as alleged by him in the petition. Therefore, the petition is liable to be dismissed.

4. Considering the limited scope of prayer sought for in this petition, this Court even without issuing notice to the third respondent inclined to pass order in this case.

5. According to the petitioner, the second respondent harassed the petitioner but the second respondent denied the same and based on the complaint lodged by the petitioner's wife, namely, the third respondent, they called the petitioner for enquiry and the petitioner also appeared for enquiry and thereafter, he gave written undertaking to return the belongings of the third



Crl.O.P(MD)No.5124 of 2025

WEB COPY

respondent and thereafter, recording the said undertaking, the complaint was closed. While so, the petitioner filed this petition.

6. In view of the same, recording the above said submission of the second respondent that they have not harassed the petitioner and based on the complaint given by the third respondent, they conducted enquiry and closed, this Criminal Original Petition stands closed.

20.03.2025

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

To

- 1.The superintendent of Police,
Trichy District,
Trichy.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Manaparai,
Trichy District.
- 3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P(MD)No.5124 of 2025

P.DHANABAL, J.

BTR

Crl.O.P(MD)No.5124 of 2025

20.03.2025