



W.P.Crl.(MD)No.39 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 05.06.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE B.PUGALENDHI

W.P.Crl.(MD)No.39 of 2025

A.Suganya

... Petitioner

versus

1. The Superintendent of Police,
Ramanathapuram District,
Ramanathapuram.

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

3.Balamalathi

... Respondent

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the constitution of India, seeking for the issuance of Writ of Mandamus the respondents No.1 and 2 to take appropriate action against the 3rd respondent by conducting enquiry based on the representation of the petitioner dated 14.05.2025 within a time frame fixed by this Court.



WEB COPY



W.P.Crl.(MD)No.39 of 2025


For Petitioner : Mr.Senthilvel RAS

For Respondents : MrAS.Abul Kalam Azad
1 & 2 Government Advocate (Crl Side)

ORDER

The petitioner has lodged a complaint dated 04.05.2025 that the 3rd respondent claiming to be the 1st wife of her husband, has threatened her and her children and she has filed this petition for a direction to the respondent police to take action on her complaint dated 04.05.2025.

2.The learned Government Advocate (Crl Side) on instructions submits that the complaint of the petitioner was received on 14.05.2025 by the Superintendent of Police, who forwarded it to the Inspector of Police, B-1 Police Station. On receipt of the same, on 01.06.2025 the Inspector of Police issued summon to the petitioner and to the 3rd respondent to appear for enquiry on 03.06.2025. However the petitioner has not appeared for enquiry. Though it has also been



W.P.Crl.(MD)No.39 of 2025


informed over phone, she has not turned up for enquiry. He further submits that for the allegations of threat, the complaint was lodged after 10 days. Further the 3rd respondent had already filed a maintenance application against the petitioner's husband in MC.No.25 of 2016 before Judicial Magistrate, Ramanathapuram and a complaint under Section 498(A) IPC was also filed against the petitioner's husband and both were closed on compromise.

3.This court considered the rival submissions made.

4.The petitioner has lodged a complaint, but has not appeared for enquiry on summon to her under Sections 179 and 94 of BNSS. Therefore, this petition is closed with liberty to the petitioner to workout her remedy in the manner known to law by filing a private complaint.

05.06.2025

DSK



W.P.Crl.(MD)No.39 of 2025

To

WEB COPY

1. The Superintendent of Police,
Ramanathapuram District,
Ramanathapuram.
2. The Inspector of Police,
Ramanathapuram District,
Ramanathapuram.
3. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



W.P.Crl.(MD)No.39 of 2025

B.PUGALENDHI, J.

DSK

W.P.Crl.(MD)No.39 of 2025

05.06.2025