



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 19.12.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS JUSTICE S.SRIMATHY

W.P.CrI.(MD) No.2716 of 2025

Indumathy

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1.The State of Tamilnadu,
Rep by the Superintendent of Police,
Madurai District.
Madurai.

2.The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Melur Sub Division,
Madurai District.

3.The Inspector of Police,
Keelavalavu Police Station,
Melur Taluk,
Madurai District.

4.M.Venkateswari

Respondent(s)

For Petitioner(s): Mr.K.Mahalakshmi

For Respondent(s): Mr.A.S.Abul Kalaam Azad
Government Advocate (CrI.side) for R1 to R3

Prayer:

This petition is filed for issuance of Writ of Mandamus, directing the 3rd respondent, to forthwith consider the petitioner's complaint, dated 12.12.2025, in the light of the orders passed in WP(MD) No.608/2025 dated 09.01.2025 and WP(MD) No.6892 of 2025 dated 14.03.2025 and to take appropriate action against the fourth respondent to peacefully cultivate the petitioner's agricultural land measuring 52 cents in Re-Survey No.646/2A , Ambalakaranpatti Village, Melur Taluk, Madurai District.



ORDER

This petition has been filed seeking issuance of a Writ of Mandamus to direct the third respondent to forthwith consider the petitioner's complaint dated 12.12.2025, in the light of the orders passed in W.P.(MD) No.608 of 2025, dated 09.01.2025 and W.P.(MD) No.6892 of 2025, dated 14.03.2025, and to take appropriate action against the fourth respondent so as to enable the petitioner to peacefully cultivate his agricultural land measuring 52 cents in Re-Survey No. 646/2A, Ambalakaranpatti Village, Melur Taluk, Madurai District.

2. Admittedly, there are disputes between the petitioner and the fourth respondent. Initially, the petitioner filed W.P.(MD) No.608 of 2025 and this Court, after hearing the learned counsel on either side, directed the third respondent to proceed with the investigation in accordance with law, vide order dated 09.01.2025. Pursuant thereto, the Inspector of Police called both the parties and advised them to approach either the Revenue Divisional Officer or the competent Civil Court.

3. Instead of approaching the RDO or the Civil Court, the petitioner again filed W.P.(MD) No.6892 of 2025. By order dated 14.03.2025, this Court, considering the limited scope of the prayer and without issuing notice to the private respondent, directed the third respondent to consider the petitioner's representation and the



relevant portion of the order is extracted hereunder:

5. According to the petitioner, she is the owner of the subject property and already she surveyed the land and fixed the boundaries and now, she wants to fence the land based on the survey already conducted. But the fourth respondent is restraining her from fencing the land. Therefore, she approached the third respondent seeking police protection.

6. The second respondent has admitted the receipt of the petitioner's representation and the same is under consideration. Therefore, the third respondent is directed to dispose of the petitioner's representation, in accordance with law, after affording opportunity to both the parties.

4. In compliance with the said direction, the Police once again conducted an enquiry and advised the parties to work out their remedy before the RDO or the Civil Court.

5. Even thereafter, the petitioner has neither approached the RDO nor instituted any proceedings before the Civil Court. Instead, he has again approached this Court alleging non-compliance of the earlier orders. Now, the prosecution has submitted that both the petitioner and the private respondent were summoned, an enquiry was conducted, and the petitioner himself submitted a written letter before the Inspector of Police. Therefore, the contention of the petitioner that the orders of



this Court were not complied with cannot be accepted. Even assuming non-compliance, the appropriate remedy available to the petitioner was to file a contempt petition, which has not been done till date. When the dispute is purely civil in nature, the petitioner ought to have approached the Civil Court seeking appropriate relief, including injunction.

6. In view of the above facts and circumstances, this Court is of the considered opinion that the present Writ Petition is not maintainable. Accordingly, this Writ Petition is dismissed. No costs.

19.12.2025

Indu

To

- 1.The Superintendent of Police,
Madurai District.
Madurai.
- 2.The Deputy Superintendent of Police,



Melur Sub Division,
Madurai District.

3. The Inspector of Police,
Keelavalavu Police Station,
Melur Taluk,
Madurai District.
4. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

S.SRIMATHY.J.

Indu



WEB COPY

WP CrI.(MD) NO. 2716



WP CrI.(MD) No.2716 of 2025

19.12.2025