



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 05-06-2026

WEB COPY

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE M. NIRMAL KUMAR

CRL OP No. 10589 of 2026

1. Mandhiri

2. Kottaiselvam

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. State rep. by
The Superintendent of Police,
Periyanaickenpalayam Circle,
Coimbatore District.

2.State rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Periyanaickenpalayam Police Station,
Coimbatore District.

3.Radhakrishnan

Respondent(s)

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023, to direct the 2nd respondent not to harass the petitioners based on the representation dated 08.04.2026.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.S.N.Arunkumar

For Respondent(s): Mr.R. Rajasekaran
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)
For R1 and R2




ORDER

WEB COPY

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed, seeking a direction to the 2nd respondent not to harass the petitioners based on the representation dated 08.04.2026.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners had sent a representation to the 1st respondent, alleging that the 2nd respondent had called them under the guise of enquiry on various occasions i.e., on 24.03.2026 and 06.04.2026, and harassed the petitioners. According to the petitioners, they had merely acted only as land broker in a land transaction between Radhakrishnan on one side and Anguraj and Deivananyagam on the other. Apart from introducing them, the petitioners had no role in the transaction. It is further submitted that Non-Traceable Certificate had been issued to the 3rd respondent and that the said certificate was subsequently found to be forged. Thereafter, Radhakrishnan filed a civil suit in O.S.No.181 of 2025 against Anguraj, Deivanayagam and the petitioners for recovery of the advance amount.

3. It is further submitted that the parties had entered into a compromise on 10.03.2026, and thereafter, the 3rd respondent had received the settlement amount and withdrew the suit in O.S.No.181 of 2025 pending on the file of the



learned Principal Subordinate Judge, Coimbatore. Despite the settlement of the dispute, the 3rd respondent allegedly lodged a false complaint against the petitioners before the 2nd respondent police and has been continuously threatening them. Therefore, the learned counsel contended that no further enquiry is required on the complaint lodged by the said Radhakrishnan and that the act of calling the petitioners for enquiry amounts to harassment.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondents 1 and 2 submitted that the 2nd respondent police had not called the petitioners for any enquiry and they were neither detained nor harassed on 24.03.2026 and 06.04.2026. Further, he submitted that, in the event of any complaint received against the petitioners, summons would be issued in accordance with law requiring their appearance for enquiry.

5. Recording the said submission made by the learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side), this Criminal Original Petition stands disposed of.

05-06-2026

Jd

Neutral Citation: Yes/No



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 10589 of 2026



M.NIRMAL KUMAR J.
jd

CRL OP No. 10589 of 2026

05-06-2026