



CRL.OP(MD) NO.7593 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT
WEB COPY

DATED : 25.04.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.DHANABAL

CRL.O.P(MD) No.7593 of 2025

V. Thayammal

... Petitioner

Vs

1. The State of Tamil Nadu,
Represented by the Superintendent of Police,
O/o. the Superintendent of Police,
Tenkasi,
Tenkasi District.

2. The Inspector of Police,
Karuvikulam Police Station,
Kuruvikulam,
Tenkasi District.

3. V. Rajesh

... Respondents

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023, to direct the 1st respondent to give suitable direction to the 2nd respondent not to interfere with the family dispute between the petitioner and the 3rd respondent in the guise of the complaint given by the 3rd respondent before the 2nd respondent by considering the petitioner's complaint dated 08.04.2025.



WEB COPY



CRL.OP(MD) NO.7593 of 2025

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Mohamed Sherbudeen

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

ORDER

This petition has been filed by the petitioner to direct the 2nd respondent not to interfere with the family dispute between the petitioner and the 3rd respondent in the guise of the complaint given by the 3rd respondent before the 2nd respondent by considering the petitioner's complaint dated 08.04.2025.

2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the 3rd respondent is none other than the son of the petitioner and he lodged a false complaint against the petitioner before the 2nd respondent. Based on the same, the 2nd respondent frequently called the petitioner by interfering with the family dispute. Therefore, she sent a representation dated 08.04.2025, the same has not been considered. Hence this petition.

3. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondents no.1 and 2 would submit that there is a family dispute



CRL.OP(MD) NO.7593 of 2025

between the 3rd respondent and the petitioner. Therefore, the 3rd respondent lodged a complaint and based on the same, they called the petitioner for enquiry. Apart from that they have not harassed the petitioner.

4. Considering the prayer sought for in this petition, this Court even without issuing notice to the 3rd respondent inclined to pass orders in this petition.

5. According to the petitioner, the 2nd respondent harassed the petitioner based on the complaint lodged by the 3rd respondent. The 2nd respondent also denied the alleged harassment. Therefore, recording the above said submission of the learned Government Advocate and considering that the dispute is between the mother and son, this criminal original petition is closed.

25.04.2025

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



WEB COPY



CRL.OP(MD) NO.7593 of 2025

P.DHANABAL, J.

Mac

To

1. The Superintendent of Police,
O/o. the Superintendent of Police,
Tenkasi,
Tenkasi District.

2. The Inspector of Police,
Karuvikulam Police Station,
Kuruvikulam,
Tenkasi District.

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

CRL.O.P(MD) No.7593 of 2025

25.04.2025

Page No. 4 of 4