



Crl.O.P(MD)No.7859 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 28.04.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

Crl.O.P(MD)No.7859 of 2025

1. Ayub Khan

2. Ahamed Sait

3. Sameem Fathima

... Petitioners

Vs

1. The State of Tamilnadu,
Rep by the Superintendent of Police,
Dindigul District,
Dindigul.

2. The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Palani, Dindigul District.

3. Tamilarasi

... Respondents

PRAYER: Criminal Original petition has been filed under Section 528 of BNSS to direct the 2nd respondent not to harass the petitioner under the guise of enquiry on the foisted complaint of the 3rd respondent.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P(MD)No.7859 of 2025

For Petitioners : Mr.T.Leninkumar,

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

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed seeking a direction to the 2nd respondent not to harass the petitioners under the guise of enquiry on the foisted complaint of the 3rd respondent.

2.The learned Counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that based on the complaint lodged by the third respondent against the petitioners, the second respondent police frequently called the petitioners for enquiry and also caused threats to the petitioners. The second respondent also coerced the petitioners to produce some documents for security and thereby, on 26.03.2025, the petitioners appeared before the second respondent and she snatched the original documents bearing Document No.3328 of 2011 and also got an undertaking letter from the first petitioner. After receipt of the title deed, the second respondent fixed a time line and directed the petitioners to return the so called



Crl.O.P(MD)No.7859 of 2025

jewels. Therefore, the petitioners sent the representation dated 19.04.2025, but the same has not been considered. Hence this petition.

3.The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent police would submit that based on the complaint lodged by the third respondent against the petitioners for misappropriation of jewels entrusted with the petitioners by the third respondent, they called the petitioners for enquiry and apart from that they have not harassed the petitioners.

4.Considering the limited scope of the prayer sought for in this petition, this Court, without even issuing notice to the private respondent, is inclined to pass order.

5.According to the petitioners, the second respondent harassed the petitioners based on the complaint lodged by the third respondent. But the second respondent denied the alleged harassment.

6.Recording the same, this Criminal Original Petition is closed.



Crl.O.P(MD)No.7859 of 2025

7.As far as the allegations in respect of custody of the sale deed is concerned, the second respondent denied the receipt of sale deed, therefore, it is for the petitioners to lodge appropriate complaint as against the second respondent separately.

28.04.2025

Internet :Yes
Index :Yes/No
NCC :Yes/No
LR

To

1. The State of Tamilnadu,
Rep by the Superintendent of Police,
Dindigul District,
Dindigul.

2. The Inspector of Police,,
All Women Police Station,
Palani,
Dindigul District.

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



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P(MD)No.7859 of 2025

P. DHANABAL, J.

LR

Crl.O.P(MD)No.7859 of 2025

28.04.2025