



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.6733 of 2024

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 15.04.2025

WEB COPY

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE P.DHANABAL

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.6733 of 2024

Srinivasan

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Deputy Superintendent of Police
Lalgudi, Trichy District

2. The Inspector of Police
Lalgudi Police Station
Trichy District

3. Chinnaiyan

.. Respondents

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS, to direct the second respondent to provide adequate Police Protection to the petitioner and his property comprised in S.No.160/5 and 161/3 admeasuring an extent of 10.5 cents situated in Patchampettai Village,Thirumanamedu,Lalgudi Taluk,Trichy District

For Petitioner : Mr.S.I. Muthiah

For Respondents : Mr.M.Sakthi Kumar
No.1 and 2 Government Advocate(Crl.Side)
No.3 : Mr.S.Karthick



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.6733 of 2024

ORDER

WEB COPY

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed by the petitioner to direct the second respondent to provide adequate Police Protection to the petitioner and his property comprised in S.No.160/5 and 161/3 admeasuring an extent of 10.5 cents situated in Patchampettai Village, Thirumanamedu, Lalgudi Taluk, Trichy District

2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is the owner of the property in S.F.No.160/5 and 161/3 admeasuring an extent of 10.5 cents situated in Patchampettai Vilage, Thirumanamedu. Lalgudi District and the third respondent and the third respondent without any rights created trouble and enjoyment over the property. Already the third respondent filed a suit in O.S.No.171 of 2006 on the file of the Additional District Munsif Court, Lalgudi and the same was dismissed inspite of that the third respondent is causing disturbance on the possession of the petitioner and also made life threat to the petitioner, thereby he sent a representation dated 03.04.2024 but no action was taken, hence he has filed this petition.



WEB COPY

3. The learned Government Advocate(Crl.Side) appearing for the respondents 1 and 2 would submit that no any representation was received by the second respondent and the petitioner lodged complaint on 03.04.2025 for taking action against the third respondent and that the complaint was also not received and if the petitioner lodges a fresh complaint they will consider the same in accordance with law.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the third respondent would submit that there is a property dispute between the petitioner and the third respondent and thereby the third respondent filed a suit in O.S.No.171 of 2006 and thereafter the same was withdrawn with liberty to file a fresh suit. The trial Court has not granted liberty to file a fresh suit on the same cause of action,there by he has filed the Civil Revision Petition before this Court and the same is pending.

5. Considering the prayer sought for in the petition and also the fact that the respondents 1 and 2 denied the receipt of the representation from the petitioner and the petitioner also not produced any documents to prove that he has sent a representation for police protection it is not proper to allow this application.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.6733 of 2024

WEB COPY

6. In view of the same, this the Criminal Original Petition stands closed. However the petitioner is at liberty to approach the second respondent by way of fresh complaint if any necessity arises in future.

15.04.2025

NCC : Yes/No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No
aav

To

1. The Deputy Superintendent of Police
Lalgudi, Trichy District
2. The Inspector of Police
Lalgudi Police Station
Trichy District
3. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.6733 of 2024

P.DHANABAL,J.

aaV

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.6733 of 2024

15.04.2025