



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 09-03-2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE M. NIRMAL KUMAR

WP CrI. No. 506 of 2026

Indhumathi

Petitioner

Vs

1. The Superintendent of Police
O/o.The Superintendent of Police,
Vengikkal,
Thiruvannamalai 606 604.
- 2.Deputy Superintendent of Police
O/o.the Deputy Superintendent of
Police,
Arani, Thiruvannamalai 632 301.
- 3.State
Rep. by its Inspector of Police
Aarani Taluk P.S.,
Thiruvannamalai.
- 4.M.Hariharan
- 5.K.Dandapani

Respondents

PRAYER

This writ petition is preferred under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking to direct the 1st to 3rd respondents to complete the enquiry and take a decision regarding the further course of action based upon the petitioner's complaint on 19.02.2026 and to dispose of the enquiry as expeditiously as possible in accordance with law and pass such further or other orders as this



Hon'ble may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case and thus render justice.

WEB COPY

For Petitioner: Mr.Munuraj G

For Respondents: Mr.Leonard Arul Joseph Selvam,
Addl. Public Prosecutor
for R1 to R3

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking for a mandamus to respondents 1 to 3 for completion of the enquiry on the basis of the complaint given by the petitioner on 19.02.2026.

2.Mr.G.Munuraj, learned counsel on record for the petitioner is before this court. Mr.Leonard Arul Joseph Selvam, learned Additional Public prosecutor takes notice for respondents 1 to 3.

3.The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has sent a representation dated 19.02.2026 to the first and second respondents, but so far no action has been taken on the said representation. It is submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has clearly narrated in her representation as to how she was deceived. It is stated that the petitioner has given five blank unfilled cheques of Federal Bank bearing nos.021672 to 021676 to one Hariharan on the promise that he would arrange for a loan from Equitas Small Finance, Arani Branch but the loan was not sanctioned. The petitioner was informed that she was not eligible for the loan. Therefore, when



the petitioner asked for the return of the blank cheques, she was informed by said Hariharan that he had handed over the cheques to one Mr.Dandapani.

Therefore, on complaint to the police, only four cheques bearing nos.021672, 021673, 021675 and 021676, except cheque bearing no.021674, were returned to the petitioner and that the said Hariharan assured that he would get back the cheque from Mr.Dandapani and would return it to the petitioner. But it was not done so. When the petitioner had questioned the same, it was replied that the said Mr.Dandapani had retained the said cheque. Now, the petitioner came to know that the said Mr.Dandapani has misused the cheque and has given a complaint under section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act. Therefore, the petitioner has sent a representation to the respondents police and as there was inaction on their part, she has preferred this petition.

4.Mr.Leonard Arul Joseph Selvam, learned Additional Public prosecutor who took notice for respondents 1 to 3 submitted that on the complaint, the petitioner was called for the enquiry and during enquiry, the said Hariharan was also present and he had handed over four cheques to the petitioner and one cheque was retained by Dandapani. When said Dandapani was enquired, he informed that he had filed a case under section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act before the Judicial Magistrate Court, Arani and that he would prove the case before the court of law. Recording the statements, the CSR was closed.



5. Considering the above submissions, now it is seen that on a complaint given by the petitioner, the respondents police have enquired the complaint and took action. It is to be noted that said Dandapani has filed a case before the Judicial Magistrate Court, Arani in STC No.549 of 2025 against the petitioner herein under the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881. But it is the case of the petitioner that the cheque retained by the said Dandapani has been misused by him. This Court is of the considered view that the veracity of the complaint given by the said Dandapani and the genuineness of the claim of the petitioner and as to how the cheque came into the possession of Dandapani and whether the cheque was issued towards discharge of any liability are all matters of fact and evidence to be decided during trial before the trial court. Now, at this stage, this court cannot give any direction to the respondents police regarding the enquiry. In view of the above, the writ petition filed by the petitioner is dismissed. No costs.

09-03-2026

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



To

1.The Superintendent of Police
O/o.The Superintendent of Police,
Vengikkal, Thiruvannamalai 606 604.

2.Deputy Superintendent of Police
O/o.the Deputy Superintendent of
Police, Arani, Thiruvannamalai 632
301.

3.The Inspector of Police
Aarani Taluk P.S., Thiruvannamalai.

4.Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court, Chennai.



WEB COPY

WP CrI. No. 506 of 2026



M.NIRMAL KUMAR J.

vvk

WP CrI. No. 506 of 2026

09-03-2026