

Crl.O.P.(MD)No. 6579 of 2025

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED :09.04.2025

CORAM :

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

Crl.O.P.(MD) No.6579 of 2025

Pulliyappan

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.State of Tamil Nadu
rep., by its the Superintendent of Police,
Office of the Superintendent of Police,
Ramanathapuram DIstrict.

2.The Inspector of Police,
Kamuthi Police Station,
Ramanathapuram District.

3.Abdul Rehman

...Respondents

Prayer : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 of Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to direct the second respondent police not
to interfere the civil cum title dispute, on the basis of the memorandum
issued by the Additional Director General of Police (L&O) Office, Chennai
in vide C.No.18/ADGP/L&O/Camp/2024 dated 09.01.2024.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Udhayakumar

For R1 & R2 : Mr.R.M.Anbunithi
Additional Public Prosecutor (crl.side)



Crl.O.P.(MD)No. 6579 of 2025

For R3

: Mr.S.Ramsundar Vijayaraj

WEB COPY

ORDER

This petition is filed by the petitioner to direct the second respondent police not to interfere with the civil-cum-title dispute, based on the memorandum issued by the Additional Director General of Police (L&O) Office, Chennai, vide C.No.18/ADGP/L&O/Camp/2024, dated 09.01.2024.

2. According to the petitioner, there is a civil dispute between the petitioner and the third respondent, for which, the third respondent lodged a false complaint against the petitioner, based on the same, the second respondent frequently called the petitioner by interfering with the civil dispute. Therefore, he sent a representation on 01.04.2025 to the first respondent, but the same has not been considered. Hence, this petition.

3. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor (Crl.side) appearing for the respondents 1 and 2, on instructions, submits that based on the complaint lodged by the third respondent, they called the petitioner for enquiry and thereafter, they registered a case in Crime No.76 of 2025. Therefore, only for enquiry purpose, they called the petitioner, apart from that they have not harassed the petitioner.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No. 6579 of 2025

WEB COPY

4. The learned counsel appearing for the third respondent submits that since the petitioner created forged document and cheated the third respondent, thereby he lodged a complaint against the petitioner, based on the same, the respondent-police have registered a case against the petitioner.

5. Considering the prayer sought for in this petition and also, considering the fact that the respondent-police have registered a case against the petitioner in Crime No.76 of 2025 and only for enquiry purpose, they called the petitioner, otherwise they have not harassed the petitioner, recording the submission of the learned Additional Public Prosecutor (Crl.side), this Criminal Original Petition is closed. However, the petitioner is at liberty to challenge the FIR in Crime No.76 of 2025 in the manner known to law, if he is aggrieved by the same.


09.04.2025

NCC : Yes / No

Index : Yes / No

Internet : Yes

Rmk



Crl.O.P.(MD)No. 6579 of 2025

To

1.The Superintendent of Police,
Office of the Superintendent of Police,
Ramanathapuram DISTRICT.

2.The Inspector of Police,
Kamuthi Police Station,
Ramanathapuram District.

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



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No. 6579 of 2025

P. DHANABAL, J.

Rmk

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.6579 of 2025

09.04.2025