



Cont .P(MD) No.2429 of 2024

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 20.02.2025

WEB COPY

CORAM

**THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE P.DHANABAL**

Cont.P(MD) No.2429 of 2024

A.M.Rizwana Parveen

.. Petitioner

Vs.

Rajeswari  
The Inspector of Police  
All Women Police Station  
Thanjavur

.. Respondent


**PRAYER :** Contempt Petition filed under Section 11 of Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 to punish upon the respondent herein for her deliberate disobedience in implementation of the order made by this Court in WP(MD)4862 of 2024 dated 06.03.2024

For Petitioner : Ms.Yamin Begum

For Respondent : Mr.M.Vaikkam Karunanithi  
Government Advocate(Crl.Side)

**ORDER**

This Contempt Petition has been filed to punish the respondent herein for her deliberate disobedience in implementation of the court made by this Court in WP(MD) No.4862 of 202



WEB COPY

2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that this Court has directed the respondent to consider the complaint with regard to the misappropriation of jewels by the respondents 3 and 4 in the writ petition who are the in-laws of the petitioner herein and complete the enquiry and if cognizable offence is made out the respondent police is directed to register the First Information Report against the respondents 3 and 4 but the respondent police without obliging the order and without conducting proper enquiry has closed the petition after enquiring the fourth respondent and without enquiring the third respondent and no proper enquiry was conducted and the petitioner was not called for enquiry, therefore there is wilful disobedience of the order passed by this Court.

3. The learned Government Advocate(Crl.Side) would submit that already the respondent police have completed enquiry and they examined fourth respondent. Since the third respondent is in abroad they are unable to examine the third respondent. The petitioner also not co-operated for the enquiry and she has not appeared for enquiry. Thereafter the enquiry was conducted and closed, therefore there is no any wilful disobedience by the respondent.



WEB COPY

4. In reply the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would further submit that the petitioner appeared for enquiry but the police have not recorded her statements.

5. Heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.

6. This Court had directed the respondent police to consider the complaint with regard to the misappropriation of jewels by the respondent 3 and 4 and to complete the enquiry and if any cognizable offence is made out register the First Information Report through order dated 06.03.2024. According to the petitioner the respondent has not enquired the complaint. According to the respondent she has conducted enquiry and filed report. In the report the respondent has stated that they have not examined the third respondent since he is in abroad and the petitioner also has not cooperated for enquiry and did not appear for enquiry. Hence after enquiring the third respondent in the main petition filed report. Therefore there is no wilful disobedience by the respondent. However if the petitioner is aggrieved by the closure report she can approach the appropriate forum in accordance with law.



Cont .P(MD) No.2429 of 2024

7. In view of the same, the contempt petition stands closed.

WEB COPY

20.02.2025

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

To

Rajeswari  
The Inspector of Police  
All Women Police Station  
Thanjavur



WEB COPY



*Cont .P(MD) No.2429 of 2024*

**P.DHANABAL,J.**

aaV

Cont.P(MD) No.2429 of 2024

20.02.2025