WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 04-11-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE G.K. ILANTHIRAIYAN

CRL.O.P.No.31937 of 2026

CNR:{HCMA012641782026}

AND

CRL.M.P.Nos.21043 & 21044 of 2026

Case QR

1. Karupasamy
   S/o.Dharmapunniyam,
   No.28, Narayanasamy Road,
   2nd Cross, Rathinapuri,
   Coimbatore District.

2. Deepa
   W/o.Sankar,
   D.No.121-125-F5,
   Perumal Kovil Street,
   Pappanaickenpalayam,
   Coimbatore South,
   Coimbatore District.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. State represented by,
   The Inspector of Police
   Ramanathapuram Police Station,
   Coimbatore District.
   Crime No.4 of 2025

2. Manoj
   S/o Subramaiyan,
   No.77/37, Pillayar Kovil Street,
   Thillaipuram, Namakkal District.
   Now Residing at,
   Dhanalakshmi Nagar,
   G.V.Residency,
   Coimbatore District.

..Respondent(s)

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to call for the records relating to C.C.No.5332 of 2025 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate Court, Additional Mahila Court, Coimbatore and quash the same.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.S.N.Arun Kumar

For R1: Mr.R.Ganesh Kumar
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

This criminal original Petition has been filed to quash the proceedings in C.C.No.5332 of 2025 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate Court, Additional Mahila Court, Coimbatore.

2. It is the case of the prosecution that on 06.01.2025, when the second respondent/*de facto* complainant went to VIP Salon and Spa Professional, Nanjundapuram Road, Ramanathapuram at Coimbatore District, the second petitioner (A2) introduced herself and stated that she had women for prostitution and invited him and further, A3 and A4 tried to seduce him, disgusted by which, he immediately left that place and lodged a complaint before the first respondent police against the petitioners. Pursuant thereto, a case was registered in Crime No.4 of 2025 for the offences under Sections 3(2)(a), 4(2)(c) and 6(1)(b) of the Immoral Traffic [Prevention] Act, 1956 (for brevity

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

"the Act") and a charge sheet has been filed before the Judicial Magistrate Court, Additional Mahila Court, Coimbatore and the same was taken on file as C.C.No.5332 of 2025.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that the entire complaint is a false and concocted one and the petitioner was arrested based on the false information received from the *de facto* complainant and the petitioners are no way connected with the alleged offences and they have not committed any such offence. It is his further submission that the first respondent without verifying the veracity of the complaint, registered the case implicating the petitioners as accused and the very registration of the First Information Report and filing of the charge sheet against the petitioners is not maintainable. He, hence, submitted that no offence is made out under Sections 3(2)(a), 4(2)(c) and 6(1)(b) of the Act. He further submitted that the proceedings against the co-accused (A3 and A4) have already been quashed by this Court *vide* order dated 23.06.2026 passed in Crl.O.P.No.10042 of 2026.

4. Heard both sides and perused the materials placed on record.

5. The main ground raised in the present petition is that the respondent police did not follow the mandatory requirements under Section 15 of the Immoral Traffic (Prevention) Act, 1956. Thus, it is relevant to rely upon

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

the judgment of this Court in ***Kadek Dwi Ani Rasmini and others vs. K. Natarajan and others*** reported in ***2019(1) LW Crl 94***, are extracted hereunder:-

"28. A careful look at the provisions of Section 15 would show that a Special Police Officer or a Trafficking Police Officer can enter upon any premises and cause a search without warrant, only after satisfying the following:—

(i) he should have reasonable grounds for believing that an offence punishable under this Act has been or is being committed;

(ii) he must believe that such an offence is committed in respect of a person living in the premises;

(iii) he should believe that the search of the premises with warrant cannot be made without undue delay; and

(iv) he must record the grounds of his belief before entering the premises.

29.The expression "Special Police Officer" is defined in Section 2(i) of the Act, to mean a Police Officer appointed by or on behalf of the State Government to be in charge of police duties within a specified area for the purpose of this Act. Similarly, the expression "Trafficking Police Officer" is defined in Section 2(j) to mean a Police Officer appointed by the Central Government under Section 13(4). I do not know and I have not come across any such Trafficking Police Officer appointed by the Central Government in terms of Section 13(4), at least in the State of Tamil Nadu.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

30. Under Sub-section (2) of Section 15, the Special Police Officer or the Trafficking Police Officer should also call upon two or more respectable inhabitants, at least one of whom should be a woman of the locality in which the place to be searched is situate, to attend and witness the search. For the purpose of enforcing the attendance of such respectable inhabitants, the Police Officer is obliged to issue an order in writing to them. If the person, who is called upon to attend and witness the search, refuses or neglects to comply with the notice, despite an order in writing being delivered to him, he is liable to be punished for an offence under Section 187 of the IPC, by virtue of Sub-section (3) of Section 15. An immunity is granted under Sub-section (6) of Section 15 to persons taking part in or attending and witnessing a search, from any civil or criminal proceedings in respect of anything lawfully done in connection with the search.

31. The Special Police Officer or the Trafficking Police Officer, who makes a search, should be accompanied by at least two women Police Officers. If any woman or girl is removed under Subsection (4) from the premises of search, she could be interrogated only by the woman Police Officer.

32. Day in and day out, newspapers compete with each other in publishing reports along with photographs of girls, whenever any search is carried out under Section 15 of the Act and any woman is removed from a place. The website of the National Crime Records Bureau shows that a total of about 2,44,270 incidents of crime against women were reported in the

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

whole country during the year 2012. Out of them, about 2563 constitute cases under the Immoral Traffic (Prevention) Act, 1956. Interestingly, 19.5% of such cases (about 500 cases out of those 2563 cases) were reported only in Tamil Nadu. This can be taken either as an indication that incidents of crime under the said Act is on the increase in Tamil Nadu or as an indication of the role played by the Police in the State of Tamil Nadu in taking the crimes under this Act more seriously than what their counterparts in the other States do.

33. Unfortunately, no accountability is fixed on the police to see whether all the requirements of Section 15 are complied with or not. No one calls upon the Special Police Officer or the Trafficking Police Officer (i) to produce records to show whether he has minuted the grounds of his belief that an offence punishable under the Act is committed or has been committed in respect of a person living in any premises, (ii) to produce records to show his subjective satisfaction that the search of the premises with warrant cannot be made without undue delay, (iii) to produce records to show whether two respectable inhabitants of the locality attended and witnessed the search, (iv) to show whether persons removed from such premises were subjected to medical examination and produced before the appropriate Magistrate immediately, and (v) to produce proof to show that two women Police Officers accompanied them and the interrogation of any woman was done only by them.

34.Many times, even persons who are booked under the provisions of this Act, do not appear to challenge the procedure

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

adopted. This is perhaps due to the fact that in most of the cases, the Police find it convenient to book a person only for an offence under Section 8, which is punishable on first conviction, either with imprisonment for a term which may extend to six months or with fine which may extend to Rs. 5,000/-. Therefore, it appears that people choose to plead guilty and pay the fine even on the first occasion and get off, instead of going through the mill, by facing the prosecution and challenging the procedure followed by the Police. The remedy is seen as worse than the disease.

35. Therefore, the only presumption that I can draw is that as against the writ petitioners herein, the Police did not carry out a search by following all the steps prescribed in Section 15. When the mandate of the law is so clear in Section 15, the respondents cannot carry out a search de hors Section 15.

36.The conclusion that we can arrive at, on the basis of the above discussion, is twofold. If the Police carry out a search of the premises where the petitioners are carrying on business activities, after following all the steps prescribed in Section 15, the petitioners cannot come under Article 226, but may have to seek redressal somewhere else. But, if the respondents are in the habit of carrying out searches in a manner not prescribed by Section 15, then the same actually tantamount to an unlawful interference with the fundamental right of the petitioners to carry on any business or profession which is not declared as unlawful by any legislation."

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

6. In the present case also, the inspection was not carried out by the Special Police Officer or the Trafficking Police Officer and the Officer, who carried out the inspection, was not an authorized officer under Section 15 of the Act. Therefore, if the search and inspection is not carried out by following the procedure prescribed under Section 15 of the Act, the entire proceeding becomes illegal and cannot be sustained in law.

7. Accordingly, this criminal original petition stands allowed and the proceedings in C.C.No.5332 of 2025 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate Court, Additional Mahila Court, Coimbatore, is hereby quashed. Connected Crl.M.Ps. are closed.

04-11-2026

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

nsd

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

To

1. The Inspector of Police
   Ramanathapuram Police Station,
   Coimbatore District.

2. The Public Prosecutor,
   Madras High Court, Chennai.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN J.

nsd

CRL OP No. 31937 of 2026

04-11-2026

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis