



W.P.CrL.(MD).No.966 of 2026

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED :20.02.2026

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MRS JUSTICE S.SRIMATHY

W.P.CrL.(MD) No. 966 of 2026

P.Siva

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Superintendent of Police,
O/o.Superintendent of Police,
Dindigul District.

2.The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
O/o.Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Nilakottai Range,
Nilakottai,
Dindigul District.

3.The Inspector of Police,
Ammaiyanaikanur Police Station,
Ammaiyanaikanur,
Dindigul District.

4.Periyasamy

5.Stalin

... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this Court to issue a ***Writ of Mandamus*** directing the respondents 1 to 3 herein to consider the petitioner's



W.P.Crl.(MD).No.966 of 2026

WEB COPY

representation/complaint dated 31.01.2026 in view of the judgment of the Honourable Supreme Court of India reported in 2014(2) SCC 1 in the case of Lalitha Kumari Vs. Government of U.P., and others.

For Petitioner :Mr.R.Vignesh

For Respondents :Mr.A.S.Abul Kaalam Azad, (for R1 to R3)
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

ORDER

The present Writ Petition has been filed for the issuance of a Writ of Mandamus, to direct the respondents 1 to 3 herein to consider the petitioner's representation/complaint dated 31.01.2026 in view of the judgment of the Honourable Supreme Court of India reported in 2014(2) SCC 1 in the case of Lalitha Kumari Vs. Government of U.P., and others.

2.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner started his own business in the name and style of "VPS Bricks". The fourth respondent is the father of the petitioner and the fifth respondent is the brother of the petitioner. The allegation against the respondents 4 and 5 is that they have illegally taken the bricks, which were manufactured by the petitioner. But, the fourth respondent himself



W.P.Crl.(MD).No.966 of 2026

WEB COPY

is claiming to be the owner of the Bricks chamber. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted he is the original owner of the said chamber, for which he has submitted the Chamber Brick Kiln Registration certificate issued by the Government of Tamil Nadu, where the petitioner's name is stated and the petitioner is the assessee under the service tax. The registered lease deed also stands in the name of the petitioner and his mother, named Malika, as the owner of the chamber. Hence, he seeks direction from the respondent police to consider his representation after hearing the petitioner.

3.The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondents Police submitted that based on the complaint given by the petitioner, an enquiry has been conducted and the same has been closed.

4.In view of the above, the fourth respondent ought to produce the relevant documents to substantiate his claim that he is the owner of the said chamber. However, the respondent police have closed the complaint merely on the basis of the statement given by the fourth respondent. But,



W.P.Crl.(MD).No.966 of 2026

WEB COPY

the documents stand in the name of the petitioner. Therefore, the respondent police are directed to conduct a fresh enquiry and take appropriate action against respondents 4 and 5, if any cognizable offence is made out.

5. With the above directions, this Writ Petition stands disposed of.

There shall be no order as to costs.

20.02.2026

NCC : Yes/No

Index : Yes/No

Internet : Yes

vsg

Note: Issue Order Copy on 25.02.2026.



WEB COPY



W.P.Crl.(MD).No.966 of 2026

To

- 1.The Superintendent of Police,
O/o.Superintendent of Police,
Dindigul District.
- 2.The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
O/o.Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Nilakottai Range,
Nilakottai,
Dindigul District.
- 3.The Inspector of Police,
Ammayanaikanur Police Station,
Ammayanaikanur,
Dindigul District.
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



W.P.Crl.(MD).No.966 of 2026

S.SRIMATHY, J

vsg

W.P.CrL.(MD) No. 966 of 2026

20.02.2026