



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 27.01.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS JUSTICE S.SRIMATHY

W.P.Crl.(MD) NO. 347 of 2026

M.Nagalakshmi

Petitioner

Vs

1.The State of Tamil Nadu
Represented by
The Superintendent of Police,
Dindigul District.

2.The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Vadamadurai,
Dindigul District.

3.Sujithkumar

Respondents

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Saravanan
for Mr.SRM.Uthiran

For Respondent(s): Mr.A.S.Abul Kalaam Azad,
Government Advocate (Crl.side) for R1 & R2

Prayer:

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a Writ of Mandamus, to direct the 1st and 2nd respondents to take action on the petitioner's complaint dated 10.01.2026 under the criminal law in the light of the dictum laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of Lalitha Kumari Vs. Government of Uttar Pradesh and others reported in (2014) 2 SCC 1.

**ORDER**

WEB COPY The present Writ Petition has been filed for the issuance of a Writ of Mandamus, to direct the 1st and 2nd respondents to take action on the petitioner's complaint dated 10.01.2026 under the criminal law in the light of the dictum laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of Lalitha Kumari Vs. Government of Uttar Pradesh and others reported in (2014) 2 SCC 1.

2.The facts stated in the affidavit are that the 3rd respondent took the custody of the petitioner's daughter Madhiarasi (aged 19 years) and retained her in his control. Since the 3rd respondent has not attained the marriageable age, the petitioner filed H.C.P.(MD)No.1444 of 2025 before this Court wherein during the course of hearing, the petitioner's daughter appeared in person and expressed her willingness to go with the 3rd respondent, as a result of which, the said petition was dismissed. Thereafter, the petitioner's daughter was in the custody of the 3rd respondent. While so, on 28.12.2025 at 2.00 p.m., the petitioner's daughter called the petitioner and she, in a feared manner, said that the 3rd respondent has been repeatedly assaulting her and he is trying to kill her. Further, unless she is secured from his hands, he may kill her. Repeatedly, the petitioner has received calls from her daughter and in all those times, she has urged for coming out from the clutches of the 3rd respondent. The said audio



conversation has been recorded by the petitioner. Immediately, on receipt of the said call, the petitioner searched for her whereabouts. At that point of time, the petitioner thought that the 3rd respondent was keeping the petitioner's daughter in a place which comes under the jurisdiction of Coimbatore City. Later, the petitioner came to know that the 3rd respondent is in Dindigul District. Hence, a specific complaint has been sent by the petitioner to the 2nd respondent on 10.01.2026. There has been no action taken by the 2nd respondent. The petitioner attempted to persuade the 1st respondent for registering an F.I.R. and has failed.

3. The petitioner submitted that since the audio evidence makes out a prima facie case for investigation for the offence under Sections 137(2) of B.N.S. and Section 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act, necessarily the F.I.R. has to be registered.

4. This Court vide order dated 23.01.2026 had recorded that the 3rd respondent has not attained the age of 21 years, hence he is not legally competent to marry and further the petitioner's daughter was subjected to torture by the 3rd respondent, hence the respondent police was directed to enquire and submit a report.



5. Today i.e. 27.01.2026 the petitioner's daughter had appeared before this Court in person and submitted that she has married the 3rd respondent and they are living happily. She also submitted that it is her mother i.e. the petitioner and her relatives are disturbing her and her husband / 3rd respondent by filing complaints. The daughter further submitted that the petitioner and her relatives are intimidating the couple and threatening them. Infact there are seeking police protection from the petitioner and her relatives. The said statement are recorded.

6. Therefore, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner's averment in the present writ petition is incorrect. The petitioner in order to disturb the couple has filed the present petition.

7. Therefore, the petitioner, her relatives and any person through her shall not disturb the petitioner's daughter and the 3rd respondent.

8. With the above observations, this Writ Petition is closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

27.01.2026

Tmg



To

1.The Superintendent of Police,
Dindigul District.

2.The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Vadamadurai,
Dindigul District.

3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.