



Crl.O.P(MD)No.5418 of 2025

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 24.03.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.DHANABAL

Crl.O.P(MD)No.5418 of 2025

Subhartra

... Petitioner

Vs.

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

2.The Inspector of Police,  
Alanganallur Police Station,  
Madurai District.

3.The Sub Inspector of Police,  
Alanganallur Police Station,  
Madurai District.

4.D.Sethuraman

... Respondents

**Prayer** : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 of B.N.S.S., 2023, to direct the respondents 1 and 2 to not to harass the petitioner without following the due process of law and not to interfere in the money dispute and pass any other orders as this Court.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P(MD)No.5418 of 2025

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Ayyanar Prem Kumar  
For R-1 to R-3 : Mr.M.Sakthi Kumar  
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

### **ORDER**

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed to direct the respondents 1 and 2 to not to harass the petitioner without following the due process of law and not to interfere in the money dispute.

2. According to the petitioner, there is a money dispute pending between the petitioner and the fourth respondent and thereby, the fourth respondent lodged a complaint against the petitioner before the respondents 2 and 3. Based on the complaint, now the respondents 2 and 3 called the petitioner frequently under the guise of enquiry by interfering with the money dispute. Therefore, she sent a representation, dated 15.03.2025 but the same has not been considered. Hence, this petition.

3. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the official respondents would submit that based on the complaint given by the



Crl.O.P(MD)No.5418 of 2025

WEB COPY

fourth respondent, they called the petitioner for enquiry and thereafter, they conducted enquiry and closed the main petition itself. Thereafter, the petitioner sent a representation, dated 15.03.2025 for the petition filed by the fourth respondent which was already closed. Therefore, nothing survives for further adjudication in this case.

4. In reply, the learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that even after the closure of the complaint from the fourth respondent, the respondents 2 and 3 insisted the petitioner to pay the amount to the fourth respondent but the learned Government Advocate appearing for the official respondents denied the said allegations. After closing the complaint, dated 05.03.2025 they have not even contacted the petitioner.

5. The prayer of the petitioner is not to harass the petitioner by interfering with the money dispute and according to the respondents 2 and 3, based on the complaint given by the fourth respondent, they called the petitioner for enquiry and the main petition itself was closed on 05.03.2025. Now the petitioner sent a representation, dated 15.03.2025 for the same complaint lodged by the fourth respondent.



Crl.O.P(MD)No.5418 of 2025

WEB COPY

6. Since the main complaint itself was already closed, nothing survives for further adjudication in this case. In view of the same, this Criminal Original Petition stands closed.

**24.03.2025**

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

To

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



WEB COPY



**Crl.O.P(MD)No.5418 of 2025**

**P.DHANABAL, J.**

BTR

**Crl.O.P(MD)No.5418 of 2025**

**24.03.2025**