



W.P.Crl.(MD)No.1411 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : **12.03.2026**

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE **MRS.JUSTICE L.VICTORIA GOWRI**

W.P.Crl.(MD)No.1411 of 2026

P.Palanisamy

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The State of Tamilnadu,
Rep by the Commissioner of Police,
Trichy City, Tiruchirappalli -620020.
2. The Assistant Commissioner Of Police,
Office of the Assistant Commissioner,
Srirangam, Tiruchirappalli -620006.
3. The Inspector of Police,
Malaikottai Police Station,
Malaikottai, Tiruchirappalli -620 002.
4. S.Radhakrishnan

... Respondents

PRAYER : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of Writ of Mandamus directing the respondents to conduct an enquiry and provide adequate armed police protection with gun man based on the petitioner's representation dated 21.02.2026 within the time limit that may be stipulated by this Court.

For Petitioner : Mr.G.Thalaimuthurasu

For Respondents : Mr.M.Sakthi Kumar (R1 to R3)
Government Advocate (Crl.)



W.P.Crl.(MD)No.1411 of 2026

ORDER

WEB COPY

This writ petition has been filed seeking for a direction to the respondents to conduct an enquiry and provide adequate armed police protection with gun man based on the petitioner's representation dated 21.02.2026 within the time limit that may be stipulated by this Court.

2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is facing a threat to his life from the fourth respondent, who is the power of attorney holder of one Dr. K. Jeyaprakash Narayanan, a joint owner of Front Line Hospital. It was further submitted that the petitioner had already lodged a complaint against the fourth respondent, alleging that he intends to grab the entire property belonging to the said Jeyaprakash Narayanan. In this regard, an FIR in Crime No. 69 of 2026 has been registered against the fourth respondent. Despite the same, the fourth respondent is continuing to threaten the petitioner with dire consequences, thereby causing a reasonable apprehension of danger to his life. In such circumstances, the petitioner sought the indulgence of this Court by directing the respondent police to consider his representation dated 21.02.2026 and to provide necessary police protection, including a gunman. However, as the same was not considered, the present writ petition has been filed.



3. The learned Government Advocate appearing for the respondent police submitted that it is not a case where the FIR was registered against the fourth respondent on the basis of the petitioner's complaint alone. On the contrary, an FIR in Crime No. 68 of 2026 was initially registered against the petitioner, and only as a counter-blast, the petitioner lodged another complaint, pursuant to which an FIR in Crime No. 69 of 2026 was registered against the fourth respondent. It was further submitted that the dispute arises out of issues relating to respective shares in Front Line Hospital, and both FIRs are presently under investigation. In such circumstances, the request of the petitioner for police protection, including provision of a gunman, is unwarranted. It was also submitted that, in the considered opinion of the respondent police, the alleged threat may not be real, particularly as the petitioner is not residing in the same locality as the fourth respondent.

4. Heard the learned counsel on either sides and carefully perused the materials available in record. Since no adverse order is proposed to be passed against the private respondents, notice to them is dispensed with.

5. It is needless to point out that whenever a representation of this nature is made to a Statutory Authority, there is a duty cast upon him to consider the



W.P.Crl.(MD)No.1411 of 2026

same on its own merits and pass appropriate orders in one way or other, instead of keeping the same pending indefinitely. As such, non-consideration of the representation by the Statutory Authority would amount to dereliction of duty and hence, this Court will be justified in invoking its extraordinary powers under Article 226 of the Constitution of India and direct them to consider the same within a stipulated time.

6. In the light of the above observations and also the submissions made, there shall be a direction to the official respondents to consider the petitioner's representation dated 21.02.2026, on its own merits and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law, after affording opportunity of hearing to the petitioner and the private respondent, within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. It is also made clear that this Court has not expressed any of its views with regard to the merits of the matter and that it is open to the respondents to consider the same on its own merits.

7. With the above direction, this writ petition is disposed of.

12.03.2026

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Sm



W.P.Crl.(MD)No.1411 of 2026

TO:-

WEB COPY

1. The Commissioner of Police,
Trichy City, Tiruchirappalli -620020.
2. The Assistant Commissioner Of Police,
Office of the Assistant Commissioner,
Srirangam, Tiruchirappalli -620006.
3. The Inspector of Police,
Malaikottai Police Station,
Malaikottai, Tiruchirappalli -620 002.
4. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



W.P.Crl.(MD)No.1411 of 2026

L.VICTORIA GOWRI, J.

Sm

Order made in
W.P.Crl.(MD)No.1411 of 2026

Dated
12.03.2026