



W.P.Crl.(MD)No.1409 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED : **12.03.2026**

CORAM:

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

W.P.Crl.(MD)No.1409 of 2026

G.Murugesan

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by the South Zone Inspector General,
O/o. The South Zone Inspector General Office,
Madurai.
2. The Superintendent of Police,
O/o. Virudhunagar District,
Virudhunagar District.
3. The Inspector of Police,
The CBCID (Crime Branch – Chennai Investigation Department) Office,
CBCID Complex – 24,
Near Commissioner Office,
Komaleeswaranpet,
Egmore, Chennai – 600 008.
4. The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Srivilliputtur Circle,
Virudhunagar District.

... Respondents

(R4 is suo motu impleaded vide order of this Court dated 12.03.2026.)

PRAYER : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of Writ of Mandamus to direct the respondent No.1 and 3 to consider the representation dated 11.02.2026 and to take appropriate action based on it.



W.P.Crl.(MD)No.1409 of 2026

For Petitioner : Mr.G.Karuppasampandian

For Respondents : Mr.M.Sakthi Kumar

Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

ORDER

This petition has been filed seeking for a direction to the respondent 1 and 3 to consider the petitioner's representation dated 11.02.2026 and to take appropriate action based on the same.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is a practising advocate with 17 years of experience at the Bar before the District Courts at Madurai and the Madurai Bench of the Madras High Court. In the year 2025, the revenue officials issued an encroachment removal notice to the petitioner and other villagers, pursuant to which the petitioner instituted a civil suit in O.S. No. 173 of 2025 on the file of the Subordinate Judge's Court, Srivilliputhur, as against the said officials. Pending the said suit, on 04.02.2025, a field inspection was conducted by the revenue and police officials, during which the petitioner was allegedly targeted by one Ayyanar, his wife Muthu, and his son Ajith Kumar, who abused him verbally. It was further alleged that they attacked the petitioner in the presence of the police and revenue authorities, who remained passive spectators to the incident.



W.P.Crl.(MD)No.1409 of 2026

WEB COPY

3. The petitioner thereafter lodged a complaint before the Inspector of Police, Krishnankovil Police Station, regarding the said occurrence. However, instead of registering an FIR on the petitioner's complaint, the Krishnankovil police allegedly obtained a complaint from the said Muthu, wife of Ayyanar, and registered an FIR against the petitioner, which, according to the petitioner, is an abuse of process of law. Hence, the petitioner submitted a representation seeking appropriate relief. As the same was not considered, the present writ petition has been filed.

4. The learned Government Advocate appearing for the respondents submitted that the revenue authorities proceeded to the spot, along with the police authorities, only pursuant to the orders of the civil Court. It was further submitted that the matter would be looked into.

5. Heard the learned counsel on either side and carefully perused the materials available on record.

6. It is not in dispute that two criminal cases have been registered against both parties in Crime Nos. 36 of 2026 and 37 of 2026 by the Inspector of



W.P.Crl.(MD)No.1409 of 2026

Police, Krishnankovil Police Station. The nature of the incident would prima facie indicate that the petitioner was attacked when he had proceeded to the field inspection in his capacity as an advocate to assist his clients, i.e., as an officer of the Court. However, at the first instance, the Inspector of Police, Krishnankovil Police Station, registered an FIR in Crime No. 36 of 2026 against the petitioner based on a complaint given by Muthu, wife of Ayyanar, and thereafter registered a counter case in Crime No. 37 of 2026 on the complaint of the petitioner. This has resulted in a case and counter-case situation. Such an approach, in the facts and circumstances of the case, appears to have resulted in unfair prejudice to the petitioner by implicating him in a criminal case, even though the materials on record do not prima facie warrant the registration of a case against him.

7. In this regard, the second respondent is directed to instruct the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Srivilliputtur Circle, Virudhunagar District, who has been suo motu impleaded as the fourth respondent and for whom Mr. M. Sakthi Kumar, learned Government Advocate, has taken notice, to conduct a fair investigation in respect of Crime Nos. 36 and 37 of 2026 and to conclude the same as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. The fourth respondent shall also



W.P.Crl.(MD)No.1409 of 2026

report the progress of the investigation to the second respondent. The second respondent is further directed to monitor the investigation and ensure that it is conducted in a fair and impartial manner.

8. With the above direction, this writ petition stands disposed of.

12.03.2026

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
sm



WEB COPY



W.P.Crl.(MD)No.1409 of 2026

L.VICTORIA GOWRI, J.

Sm

TO:-

1. The South Zone Inspector General,
O/o. The South Zone Inspector General Office,
Madurai.
2. The Superintendent of Police,
O/o. Virudhunagar District,
Virudhunagar District.
3. The Inspector of Police,
The CBCID (Crime Branch – Chennai Investigation Department) Office,
CBCID Complex – 24,
Near Commissioner Office,
Komaleeswaranpet,
Egmore, Chennai – 600 008.
4. The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Srivilliputtur Circle, Virudhunagar District.
5. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.

Order made in
W.P.Crl.(MD)No.1409 of 2026

Dated
12.03.2026