



CONT.P.(MD)No.2826 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 02.12.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.MURALI SHANKAR

CONT.P.(MD)No.2826 of 2025

in

CRL.O.P.(MD)No.18118 of 2024

R.Sethupathy

... Petitioner/
Petitioner

Vs.

1.Mr.Ramachandran
The Inspector of Police,
Karaikudi North Police Station,
Sivagangai District.

2.Mr.Ravendran
The Inspector of Police,
Manamadurai Police Station,
Sivagangai District.

3.Mr.Selvakumar
The Inspector of Police,
Perumalpuram Police Station,
Tirunelveli City.

4.Mr.Chandramohan
The Inspector of Police,
D2 Pallapatti Police Station,
Salem City.

... Contemnors

*(R2 to R4 are suo motu impleaded as per of this Court
dated 15.10.2025 passed in Cont.P.(MD)No.2826 of 2025)*



CONT.P.(MD)No.2826 of 2025

PRAYER: Contempt Petition filed under Section 11 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, to punish the contemnors for their willful disobedience of the order dated 22.10.2024 made in CrI.O.P.(MD)No.18118 of 2024 passed by this Court.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Sureshkumar

For Respondents : Mr.B.Thanga Aravindh
Government Advocate (Criminal Side)

ORDER

The Contempt Petition has been filed to punish the respondents for their wilful disobedience of the order passed by this Court in CrI.O.P. (MD)No.18118 of 2024 dated 22.10.2024.

2. When the matter is taken up for hearing today, in pursuance of the direction of this Court, the respondents 2 to 4 are present before this Court. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondents would submit that the first respondent (present Inspector attached to Karaikudi North Police Station) is taking treatment and hence, unable to attend the Court today.

3. It is evident from the records that the petitioner gave a representation seeking police protection and since there was no action, he



CONT.P.(MD)No.2826 of 2025

filed a petition in CrI.O.P.(MD)No.18118 of 2024 before this Court invoking Section 528 BNSS seeking direction for police protection and this Court vide order dated 22.10.2024 directed the Inspector of Police, Karaikudi North Police Station, to issue notice to the petitioner as well as the private respondent and conduct enquiry and pass orders within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of copy of that order. The petitioner alleging non-compliance filed the present contempt petition.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondents would submit that initially notice was sent to the petitioner on 15.01.2025 directing him to appear on 18.01.2025. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would also concede the same and would submit that though he appeared for the enquiry, the other side has not turned up.

5. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondents would submit that after the petitioner's contempt petition, they have sent a notice to the petitioner to attend the enquiry scheduled on 10.10.2025 but since the petitioner was not found, notice was affixed on the door of his house and that subsequently they came to



CONT.P.(MD)No.2826 of 2025

know that the petitioner was arrested in connection with the case in Crime No.360 of 2025 for the offences under Sections 316(2), 318(2), 318(4), 69, 296(b) and 351(3) BNS and Sections 3(l)(r) and 3(l)(s) of the SC/ST (POA) Act. He would further submit that since the petitioner was in the custody of the Deputy Superintendent of Police, who is the investigating officer for the case in Crime No.360 of 2025, the first respondent enquired him and on the basis of the enquiry, complaint was ordered to be closed.

6. It is not in dispute that the petitioner moved an application before the Special Court for Exclusive Trial of cases under SC/ST (POA) Act, Sivagangai for bail and the same was ordered to be dismissed and challenging the said dismissal order, he filed an appeal before this Court in Crl.A.(MD)No.1177 of 2025 and this Court, considering the gravity of the offence alleged and the initial stage of the investigation, dismissed the appeal and thereby confirmed the order of the trial Court.

7. Since the petitioner made a representation for police protection, considering the fact that the petitioner is having a criminal case for grave offences and is in judicial custody, the same cannot be looked into.



CONT.P.(MD)No.2826 of 2025

Moreover, the first respondent, after enquiry, closed the complaint and produced the copy of the closure report. Hence, this Court concludes that nothing survives in the contempt petition. Accordingly, this Contempt Petition stands dismissed. The petitioner is at liberty to challenge the closure report in the manner known to law, if so advised.

02.12.2025

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

To

- 1.Mr.Ramachandran
The Inspector of Police,
Karaikudi North Police Station,
Sivagangai District.
- 2.Mr.Ravendran
The Inspector of Police,
Manamadurai Police Station,
Sivagangai District.
- 3.Mr.Selvakumar
The Inspector of Police,
Perumalpuram Police Station,
Tirunelveli City.
- 4.Mr.Chandramohan
The Inspector of Police,
D2 Pallapatti Police Station,
Salem City.
- 5.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



CONT.P.(MD)No.2826 of 2025

K.MURALI SHANKAR, J.

csn

ORDER MADE IN

CONT.P.(MD)No.2826 of 2025
in
CRL.O.P.(MD)No.18118 of 2024

Dated : 02.12.2025