WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 20.06.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE B.PUGALENDHI

WPCrl(MD)No.233 of 2025

Jeyaprakash ... Petitioner

versus

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

2.The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Dindigul Rural,
Dindigul,
Dindigul District.

3.The Inspector of Police,
Dindigul Taluk Police Station,
Dindigul.

4.The Inspector of Police,
District Crime Branch,
Unit – II, Land Anti Grabbing Cell,
Dindigul. ... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the constitution of India, seeking for the issuance of Writ of Mandamus directing the 3rd respondent to transfer the case to the 4th respondent for taking

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

necessary action based on the complaint given by the petitioner dated 15.05.2025.

For Petitioner : Mr.N.Madhava Govindan

For Respondents : Mr.E.Antony Sahaya Prabahar,
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

The petitioner has approached this Court seeking for a direction to transfer the investigation that his case has not been properly investigated.

2.The learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has already filed a writ petition in WP(MD)No.2245 of 2025, wherein this Court has directed the petitioner to appear before the District Crime Branch -II, Land Grabbing Cell, Dindigul and also directed the District Crime Branch to conduct enquiry.

3.The learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents submits that the District Crime Branch -II, Land Grabbing

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Cell, Dindigul has conducted investigation and found the complaint was civil nature. The dispute is with regard to the title of the property and the police are not supposed to interfere in the civil dispute. Therefore, the complaint was closed.

4.The learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the District Crime Branch for the best reasons known to them has not properly conducted the investigation.

5.This Court considered the rival submissions made.

6.Considering the scope in the writ petition, this Court directs the 3rd respondent to furnish a copy of the closure report to the petitioner The petitioner is at liberty to work out his remedy in the manner known to law.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

7.This writ petition is closed in the above terms. No costs.

20.06.2025

DSK

Internet : Yes / No.

To

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

2.The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Dindigul Rural,
Dindigul,
Dindigul District.

3.The Inspector of Police,
Dindigul Taluk Police Station,
Dindigul.

4.The Inspector of Police,
District Crime Branch,
Unit – II, Land Anti Grabbing Cell,
Dindigul.

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

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

B.PUGALENDHI, J.

DSK

WPCrl(MD)No.233 of 2025

20.06.2025

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis