



CRL.OP(MD) NO.6364 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED : 07.04.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.DHANABAL

CRL. O.P(MD) No.6364 of 2025

N.Jakanammal

... Petitioner

Vs.

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

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

3.Mohan

... Respondents

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023 to direct the second respondent not to harass the petitioner and her family members under the guise of enquiry.

For petitioner : Mr.S.Prabhu



WEB COPY



CRL.OP(MD) NO.6364 of 2025

For R1 & R2 : Mr.M.Sakthi Kumar,
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

ORDER

This petition has been filed by the petitioner to direct the second respondent not to harass the petitioner and her family members under the guise of enquiry.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the third respondent lodged a complaint before the second respondent that the petitioner's son said to have been kidnapped the third respondent's minor daughter on 25.03.2025. However, in fact, the petitioner has no knowledge about the said occurrence and already the petitioner explained about the same before the second respondent. In spite of that, the second respondent insisted the petitioner to be present in the police station upto 10.00 p.m. Therefore, the petitioner sent a representation to the first respondent on 01.04.2025, but the same has not been considered. Hence, she filed this petition.



CRL.OP(MD) NO.6364 of 2025

WEB COPY

3. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) for the respondents 1 and 2 would submit that the third respondent lodged a complaint stating that his minor daughter was kidnapped by the petitioner's son. In an earlier occasion also, due to love affair, the daughter of the third respondent eloped with the petitioner's son and thereafter, the police secured them and they got separated. Once again, the third respondent lodged a complaint alleging that his daughter was missing. Therefore, for the enquiry purpose, the second respondent called the petitioner and not harassed her as alleged in the petition.

4. Considering the prayer sought for in this petition, this Court, without issuing notice to the third respondent, is inclined to pass orders.

5. According to the petitioner, the second respondent harassed the petitioner without any valid reason and insisted her to be present till 10.00 p.m. in the police station. The said allegation was denied by the second respondent. Based on the complaint lodged by the third respondent that his minor daughter is missing, they called the petitioner for enquiry.

6. In view of the above, recording the abovesaid submission of the



CRL.OP(MD) NO.6364 of 2025

learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side), this Criminal Original Petition

WEB COPY is closed.

07.04.2025

NCC : Yes/No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No
apd

To

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

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

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



WEB COPY



CRL.OP(MD) NO.6364 of 2025

P.DHANABAL,J

apd

CrI.OP(MD) No.6364 of 2025

07.04.2025