



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.11153 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 16.10.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

Crl.O.P.(MD).No.11153 of 2025

1. Kumaresan
2. Ramuthai
3. Nalluchamy
4. Karthick

... Petitioners

Vs.

1. The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by the Superintendent of Police,
Madurai District.
2. The Inspector of Police,
Balamedu Police Station,
Madurai District.
3. Prithivirajan
4. Muthukumar
5. Vignesh
6. Rasupillai
7. Muruganantham
8. Murugan
9. Chidambaram
10. S.G.Arivu

...Respondents



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.11153 of 2025

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C., to issue direction direction the 2nd Respondent not to harass the Petitioners without following due process of law.

For Petitioners	: Mr.R.Murugappan
For R1 & R2	: Mr.K.Sanjai Gandhi Government Advocate(crl.side)
For R3 & R4	: Mr.r.Murugha Boopathy

ORDER

The petitioner seeks a direction to the second respondent not to harass the petitioners under the guise of enquiry.

2.When the matter was heard by the learned predecessor, the learned Judge had directed the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Madurai to obtain a report from the learned Judicial Magistrate, Vadipatti and file the same before this Court explaining as to why CrI.M.P.No.257 of 2025 was entertained by the learned Magistrate under Section 175(3) and as to why, without passing any final orders, the learned Magistrate had directed the respondent police to produce the files in CSR No.553 of 2024.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.11153 of 2025

3.The learned Chief Judicial Magistrate had filed the report stating that the learned Magistrate had only numbered the petition and had not directed the Police Officer to conduct an enquiry and no notice was sent to the proposed accused.

4.The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that under the guise of an enquiry, the petitioner is forced to execute certain documents and also produce the original documents.

5. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent police would submit that on the complaint given by the third respondent, an enquiry is pending and that the enquiry would be completed within a period of two weeks. He would further submit that the respondent police never forced the petitioners to execute any document.

6.The learned counsel for the respondents 3 and 4, per contra, would submit that the complaint discloses cognizable offences and therefore, a complaint was lodged and the allegation that the petitioners were forced to execute documents is false.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.11153 of 2025

7.In the light of the above submissions and without going into the merits of the respective submissions and considering the report filed by the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, this Court is inclined to direct the respondent police to complete the enquiry within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. The copy of the enquiry report shall be sent to both the petitioner and the third respondent. It is needless to say that if no cognizable offence is made out, the respondent shall close the complaint.

8.With the above direction, this Criminal Original Petition is disposed of.

16.10.2025

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

cp

To

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

4/5



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.11153 of 2025

SUNDER MOHAN, J.

cp

Crl.O.P.(MD).No.11153 of 2025

16.10.2025