



Crl.O.P(MD)No.5251 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 21.03.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

Crl.O.P(MD)No.5251 of 2025

G.Karthick Raja

...Petitioner

Vs.

1.The DIGP,
CRPF Group Center (GC) Avadi,
C.R, P. Cross Rd,
Avadi, New Vellanur,
Tamil Nadu-600065.

2.The Superintendent of Police,
Madurai District,
Madurai.

3.The Inspector of Police,
AWPS - Samayanallur,
Madurai District.

4.K.Sneha

... Respondent/Respondents

PRAYER: Criminal Original petition has been filed under Section 528 of BNSS to directing the Respondents No.1 to 3 not to interfere into the Civil dispute (Matrimonial Dispute) and not to harass the petitioner and his family members under the guise of enquiry.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P(MD)No.5251 of 2025

For Petitioner : Mr.A.B.Jeeva


For R1 : Mr.K.Govindarajan
Deputy Solicitor General of India

For R2 and R3 : Mr.M.Sakthi Kumar
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed seeking a direction to the respondents 1 to 3 not to interfere into the Civil dispute (Matrimonial Dispute) and not to harass the petitioner and his family members under the guise of enquiry.

2.According to the petitioner, there is a family dispute pending between the petitioner and fourth respondent, who are husband and wife. Already they got separated while the case in H.M.O.P.No.260 of 2025 is pending before the Family Court, Madurai. While so, the fourth respondent lodged a false complaint against the petitioner and the same was closed after enquiry. Again the fourth respondent lodged the present complaint. Hence, the respondent police frequently called petitioner for



Crl.O.P(MD)No.5251 of 2025

enquiry. Therefore this petition has been filed.

WEB COPY

3.The learned Counsel for the first respondent would submit that the first respondent is not harassing the petitioner as alleged by him. He is no way connected with this matrimonial dispute.

4.The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent police 2 and 3 would submit that the earlier complaint lodged by the fourth respondent was closed on 05.07.2024. Again she sent a representation to the second respondent and the same was forwarded to the third respondent, thereby, he called the petitioner for enquiry purpose. Apart from that there is no harassment made to the petitioner.

5.Considering the limited scope of the prayer sought for in this petition, this Court, without even issuing notice to the private respondent, is inclined to pass order.

6.In view of the submissions made on either side, recording the submission of the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondents 2 and 3 and the petitioner is also working in Army and



Crl.O.P(MD)No.5251 of 2025

already, the earlier complaint was enquired and closed, the petitioner is at liberty to sent a reply to the third respondent through postal and after considering the same, the third respondent has to act in accordance with law. However, if the appearance of the petitioner is absolutely necessary, then the petitioner can appear through video conferencing for enquiry.

7.With the above direction, this criminal original petition is disposed of.

21.03.2025

Internet :Yes
Index :Yes/No
NCC :Yes/No
LR

To

1.The DIGP,
CRPF Group Center (GC) Avadi,
C.R, P. Cross Rd,
Avadi, New Vellanur,
Tamil Nadu-600065.

2.The Superintendent of Police,
Madurai District,
Madurai.



Crl.O.P(MD)No.5251 of 2025

3.The Inspector of Police,
AWPS - Samayanallur,
Madurai District.

4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P(MD)No.5251 of 2025

P. DHANABAL, J.

LR

Crl.O.P(MD)No.5251 of 2025

21.03.2025