



W.P.(MD) No.11029 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED : 22.04.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.DHANABAL

W.P.(MD) No.11029 of 2025

Harine

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Superintendent of Police,
Office of the Superintendent of Police,
Virudhunagar District.

2. The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Office of the Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Rajapalayam Sub-Division,
Virudhunagar District.

3. The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Rajapalayam,
Virudhunagar District.

4. Selvam

5. Shanmugaraj

6. Samuthiram

7. Karthick

8. Ashokkumar

... Respondents



W.P.(MD) No.11029 of 2025

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, for issuance of Writ of Mandamus, directing the 3rd respondent take appropriate action against in the petitioner based on his representation dated 04.12.2024.

For Petitioner : Mr.D.Rajaboopathy

For R1 to R3 : Mr.R.M.Anbunithi
Additional Public Prosecutor (Crl. Side)

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed by the petitioner to direct the 3rd respondent take appropriate action against the petitioner based on his representation dated 04.12.2024.

2. According to the petitioner, she lodged a complaint against the respondents no.4 to 8, but no action was taken. Therefore, she has filed this petition.

3. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondents no.1 to 3 would submit that the representation of petitioner was already considered and they assigned C.S.R.No.732 of 2024 and the same was closed on 07.02.2025 after an elaborate enquiry. Therefor, nothing survives for further adjudication in



W.P.(MD) No.11029 of 2025

this case.

WEB COPY

4. Considering the prayer sought for in the petition, this Court without even issuing notice to the private respondents no.4 to 8 inclined to pass orders in this petition.

5. According to the petitioner, she sent a representation dated 04.12.2024 before the 3rd respondent as against the respondents no.4 to 8, but the same was not considered. According to the 3rd respondent, the representation of the petitioner was already considered and the same was closed after enquiry, therefore it is for the petitioner to challenge the closure of the complaint in the manner known to law, if she is aggrieved. Today the copy of the closure report is also served to the petitioner's counsel. In view of the same, the petitioner is at liberty to challenge the closure of the complaint in the manner known to law, if she is aggrieved and this writ petition is closed.

22.04.2025

Internet :Yes
Index :Yes/No
NCC :Yes/No
Mac



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD) No.11029 of 2025

P.DHANABAL, J.

Mac

To

1. The Superintendent of Police,
Office of the Superintendent of Police,
Virudhunagar District.
2. The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Office of the Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Rajapalayam Sub-Division,
Virudhunagar District.
3. The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Rajapalayam,
Virudhunagar District.
4. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

W.P.(MD) No.11029 of 2025

22.04.2025