



WEB COPY

WP CrI. No. 362 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 16-03-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE M. NIRMAL KUMAR

WP CrI. No. 362 of 2026

T.Tamilamuthan

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

The Commissioner of Police,
Tambaram Commissionerate,
Tambaram - 600 119.

..Respondent(s)

To issue a writ of certiorarified mandamus or any other appropriate writ directing the respondent Commissioner of Police, Tambram to provide continuous police protection to the petitioner and his family and pass such further or other orders as this honourable court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.A.Natarajan, Senior Counsel
For M/s.D.Adhiyaman

For Respondent(s): Mr.Leonard Arul Joseph Selvam,
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

The petitioner, who is the President of Adhanur Panchayat, submitted a representation dated 12.02.2026 to the Commissioner of Police, Tambaram, objecting to the withdrawal of Police protection on 10.02.2026 without prior notice and seeking for continuation of Police protection.



2. The contention of the petitioner is that he belongs to DMK party and he is also the president of Adhanur Panchayat. His wife Malarvizhi Tamilamuthan, also belongs to DMK party and she is a member of Kundrathur Panchayat Union. The petitioner runs a Company, namely, Classic Service Private Ltd. supplying workers on contract basis. The petitioner is doing this business for more than 30 years and he is having around 10,000 employees under him. Due to political rivalry, he had been constantly threatened. Within few days of him taking over as the president, LED lights, which he had installed, were damaged and in this regard he lodged a complaint on 15.11.2021. He also faced disputes in supplying labourers to a Sweet Confectionery Industry. Further, the former MLA of Poonmallee had a tiff with him and he was attempted to be assaulted. On the petitioner's complaint, a case in Crime No.453 of 2022 was registered. On 20.01.2023, the petitioner's Bolero Car, which was parked near Ellai Amman Koil, was set on fire.

3. Despite these incidents, the petitioner has been continuing his political activities and successfully doing his business activities. This created rivals and he had been targeted. The petitioner due to paucity of time could not get trained in shooting and hence he could not apply for gun licence but his son-in-law had obtained gun licence. While that being so, on 10.02.2026, without prior notice, the Police Guard provided to him was withdrawn. The petitioner still



apprehends threat to his life and property and hence, prays for Police protection to be restored and he is ready to pay necessary charges.

WEB COPY

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor filed a counter giving reasons for withdrawal of the Police Force. It is stated that the Intelligence Section of Tambaram City Police, had assessed the threat perception and found that the petitioner's claim is imaginary and no such situation is prevailing as stated by the petitioner. Hence, the Deputy Commissioner of Police, Tambaram vide his proceedings C.No.1/DC-TMB/Proc/2025, dated 27.02.2026 had withdrawn the Armed PSO entrusted to the petitioner.

5. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor further submitted that due to the ensuing general elections, the Police force is dearth of men. Further the over all security situation is being properly assessed and there have been regular routine checks and Armed Forces have been deployed in sensitive areas and proper security arrangements have been made through out the State to avert any untoward incident and conduct free and fair election. At this stage, the petitioner's prayer cannot be considered and further there is no death perception as projected by the petitioner.

6. The counter filed by the Assistant Commissioner of Police, Manimangalam Range, Tambaram District is extracted hereunder:



**“COUNTER AFFIDAVIT FILED BY THE ASSISTANT
COMMISSIONER OF POLICE, MANIMANGALAM RANGE,
TAMBARAM POLICE DISTRICT**

WEB COPY

I, M.G. Sundar, aged 59 years, S/o. M. Gnanasekaran presently working as Assistant Commissioner of Police, Manimangalam Range of Tambaram Police District, Tambaram City Police do hereby solemnly affirm and sincerely state as follows.

2. I respectfully submit that I am well acquainted with the facts and circumstances of the petition from the records available to me and hence I am filing this Counter Affidavit. The prayer of the petitioner is that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to DIRECT the respondent/the Commissioner of Police, Tambaram City Police to restore and extend the police protection earlier granted to the petitioner and his family pending disposal of the writ petition.

3. It is submitted that the petitioner is the elected President of Aadhanur Village and also a Managing Director of classic Services Private Limited, a labour contracting company where 10,000 workers are employed under his management. The petitioner further stated that this large scale operation has made him a prominent figure in the industrial sector, but it has also created business competition and resentment among his enemies who have repeatedly attempted to intimidate him and obstruct his activities.

4. It is further submitted that the petitioner has sought police protection by submitting a representation on 23.08.2023 and the Commissioner of Police, Tambaram City Police has ordered that a gun man be deputed to provide him police protection. Since then, continuous police protection has been afforded to him after scrutinizing the threat perception by conducting an overt and covert enquiry and was extended to him upto 10.02.2026 based on the circumstances prevailed at that time. At that point of time, eventhough the situation of threat perception is minimal, gun man was provided to him as a precautionary measure. It is also pertinent to note that, not even a single incident was reported where his foes attempted on his life. The statement of the petitioner that the attacks on him were not spontaneous, but carefully organized to eliminate him is incorrect. It is a clear fact that no attempt was made on his life since last three years as inferred by the petitioner.

5. It is also submitted that the first incident of vandalyzing the Panchayath Office by his adversaries was reported on 15.11.2021. It is a surmise rather than fact to state that it is an attack aimed on him. If the threat perception is true, his adversaries could have continued such incidents after failure of such attempts. No such incident was reported later in continuation of this incident. The other incident where he was reportedly attacked by former MLA and his men at Minda Sal Factory at Thiruvallur which is owned by the client of the petitioner and his company manager is brutally assaulted by the said persons is also exaggerated. In this connection, a case was registered by Thiruvallur Taluk Police Station in Crime No. 453/2022 u/s. 323, 506(ii) IPC. If the statement of the petitioner that twenty rowdies have made an



WEB COPY



attempt on his life is true, he would have been injured. The alleged occurrence of setting fire of his owned Bolero car on 20.01.2023 is concerned, it is not an attempt on his life. In order to gain weightage to his representation to restore police protection, the petitioner has magnified simple incidents in to big ones by projecting the said incidents as if aimed on his life. As far as demanding of money from him by few rowdies is concerned, this should not be a reason for restoring police protection without verification of the credibility of his statement.

6. It is further submitted that threat perception as stated by the petitioner is very minimal and not up to the extent of endangering his life. Further, since 3 years not even a single incident of attack was reported. His statement that he is having enemies due to business rivalry is an inference without any evidence or valid reason. The incident which was reported inside a company at Tiruvallur is just a verbal duel between him and another group and no one either attacked him or his manager as stated by him.

7. It is further submitted that after considering the above facts and circumstances and after receiving the report from the Intelligence Section of Tambaram City Police, in which the Intelligence Section clearly stated that the threat perception raised by the petitioner is imaginary and no such situation is prevailed as stated by the petitioner. Hence, the Deputy Commissioner of Police, Tambaram Police District is also not intended to entertain his request for restoration of police protection through his proceedings vide C. No. 1/DC-TMB/Proc/2025 dated 27.02.2026. Hence, it was concluded that the situation does not warrant any necessity to continue armed PSO to the petitioner Thiru Tamilamuthan as there is a chance of him misusing the provision of Armed PSO and suggested that he may arrange the personal private security for his personal safety on his own.

7. I further respectfully submit that at this point of time, I would like to cite an earlier judgement of this Hon'ble Court delivered on the writ petition of one Sri. Venkatesh vide W.P. No. 5163 of 2024 where the petitioner seek a direction to the respondents to provide police protection to the life and property of the petitioner based on his representations/complaints. Excerpts from point No. 15 of the judgement denotes that "While considering the plea for grant of police protection, it is very important to take note of the back ground and stature of the person, who is seeking for such a police protection. If the petitioner is a person without any back ground of criminal cases pending against him, this Court would have straight away directed the respondents to provide police protection to the petitioner without any hesitation. If there are pending criminal cases against a person and if he develops enmity/rivalry due to his own activities, even in such cases there is a threat perception. However, if this court directs to give police protection to such persons, it will send a wrong signal to the society and a normal citizen should not get an impression that people with criminal back ground are also provided with police protection. If such an impression is created, they will loose their faith in the existing system. Further, excerpts from point No. 26 denotes that "In the considered view of this Court, wherever the person seeking for police protection has a criminal back ground and such a threat perception is as a result of his own activities, this court should be very



hesitant to grant police protection" In the result, this Hon'ble Court is not inclined to provide personal security officer to the petitioner as requested by him in the writ petition.

8. It is also submitted that, at this point of time, I would like to cite a judgement pronounced by the Hon'ble High Court of Madras in related to a petition of one Thiru Durai Shanmuga Manikandan in W.P. No. 17524 of 2025 and WMP Nos. 19872 and 19874 of 2025 where the petitioner has prayed to issue a Writ of certiorarified mandamus to call for the entire records in SBA-2 No.453-1/IS/TBM(c)/2024 dated 21.04.2025 and quash the same consequently directing the respondents to provide Armed Personal Security Officer (PSO) to the petitioner along with police protection for round the clock to petitioner's residence. Further this Hon'ble Court relied upon the 26th paragraph of already cited judgement in W.P. No. 5163 of 2024 in which it was stated that "Such a threat perception as a result of his own activities, this court should be very hesitant to grant police protection". The petitioner, as per his statement is a businessman and would have few differences with other businessmen, but not to the extent of assaulting each other. Hence, in all probability the representation of the petitioner to restore the police protection has no credibility due to the above stated reasons.

9. It is further submitted that, eventhough the petitioner's representation to restore the police protection is rejected, round the clock surveillance of his house and it's surroundings is ensured and a patta book is also placed in his house. Intelligence will be collected periodically to find whether any threat perception is brewing and in the event of such developments, his request to restore the police protection will be considered based on the gravity of the situation.

In view of the above submissions, facts and circumstances, I pray this Hon'ble Court to consider my Counter Affidavit and dismiss the writ petition in the interest of justice."

7. Considering the submissions of both sides and perusal of materials, it is seen that the Deputy Commissioner of Police, Tambaram after getting report from Intelligence Section of Tambaram City Police finding that the death perception raised by the petitioner is not alarming as projected issued proceedings for withdrawal of the armed PSO provided to the petitioner.



8. Further, it is seen that on considering the petitioner's representation, there have been round-the-clock surveillance of his house and surrounding areas. A “patta book” has been placed in his house and regular Police patrols are posted. If any threat perception is brewing, the petitioner's request to restore the Police Force will be considered on the basis of the gravity of the situation.

9. In view of the above, this Court is not inclined to entertain the petition. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.

16-03-2026

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Neutral Citation: Yes/No
PVS

To
The Commissioner of Police,
Tambaram Commissionerate,
Tambaram - 600 119.



WEB COPY

WP CrI. No. 362 of 2



M.NIRMAL KUMAR, J.

PVS

WP CrI. No. 362 of 2026

16-03-2026