



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.22838 of 2024

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 07.02.2025

WEB COPY

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE P.DHANABAL

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.22838 of 2024

Mohammed Kasim

.. Petitioner

Vs.

**1. The Superintendent of Police
Tirunelveli District
Tirunelveli**

**2. The Inspector of Police
Thisayanvilai Police Station
Tirunelveli District**

3. Syed Meera Natchiyar

.. Respondents

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS, to direct the respondents 1 and 2 to provide adequate police protection for the petitioner's life and limb by considering the petitioner's representation dated 13.11.2024.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Suresh

**For Respondents : Mr.M.Sakthi Kumar
No.1 and 2 Government Advocate(Crl.Side)**



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.22838 of 2024

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed to direct the respondents 1 and 2 to provide adequate police protection for the petitioner's life and limb by considering the petitioner's representation dated 13.11.2024.

2. According to the petitioner he owned property in S.No.890/1 of Kasturirengapuram Village, Radhapuram Taluk, Tirunelveli District. While so, the third respondent is claiming right over the property and filed a civil suit in O.S. No. 358 of 1989 on the file of the District Munsif Court, Valliyoor and the same was dismissed. Against which appeal in A.S. No. 80 of 1997 was filed before the Principal Sub Ordinate Judge, Tirunelveli and the same was ended in favour of the petitioner. Thereafter second appeal was filed in S.A.No.477 of 2000 and the same was also dismissed. After that the petitioner is continuously facing threat from the third respondent. Therefore the petitioner has sent a representation dated 13.11.2024 to the respondents 1 and 2 seeking police protection but no action was taken, therefore he has filed the present petition.



WEB COPY

3. The learned Government Advocate(Crl.Side) appearing for the respondents 1 and 2 would submit that already representation of the petitioner was considered and the same was closed as civil in nature and therefore they have to seek appropriate remedy before the civil Court.

4. Heard both sides and perused the materials. Considering the nature of limited prayer sought for by the petitioner without issuing notice to the third respondent this Court is inclined to pass orders.

5. According to the petitioner he is the owner of the property and he got civil Court decree in his favour, inspite of that third respondent is interfering with the possession of the property for that he had lodged complaint and after enquiry the same was closed by the respondent police stating that it is a civil dispute and they have to approach the civil Court.

6. This Court also perused the petition averments. No where in the petition, the petitioner has stated about the specific act done by the third respondent and only vague averments have been made in the petition. Therefore it is not appropriate to consider the prayer of the petitioner. More over already the representation of the petitioner was considered and



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.22838 of 2024

it was closed by the respondents 1 and 2. While so, it is for the petitioner to approach the second respondent police with specific allegation in order to take appropriate action.

7. With the above observation and direction, the Criminal Original Petition stands disposed of.

07.02.2025

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

To

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



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.22838 of 2024

P.DHANABAL,J.

aaV

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.22838 of 2024

07.02.2025