IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.BALAKRISHNAN NAIR &
THE HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE M.C.HARI RANI
MONDAY, THE 11TH AUGUST 2008 / 20TH SRAVANA 1930

.....

WP(C).No. 37879 of 2007(H)

PETITIONER:

- 1. MAGI.K.J., D/O.JOSEPH, AGED 50 YEARS, KATTIKKATTUTHAYYIL, FORTKOCHI VELI, KOCHI-1.
- 2. K.J.LAWRANCE, S/O.JOSEPH, AGED 67 YEARS, KATTIKKATTUTHAYYIL, BANK QUARTERS, NAZARETH, KOCHI.

BY ADV. SRI.C.A.CHACKO SMT.C.M.CHARISMA SRI.N.A.SHAFEEK

RESPONDENTS:

- 1. THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF POLICE, MATTANCHERY.
- 2. THE SUB INSPECTOR OF POLICE, FORT KOCHI POLICE STATION, FORT KOCHI.
- 3. SAIMON, S/O.JOSEPH, KATTIKKATTUTHAYYIL, FORT KOCHI VELI, CENTRE ODATHA, KOCHI-1.
- 4. PATHER, S/O.JOSEPH, KATTIKKATTUTHAYYIL, FORTKOCHI VELI, CENTRE ODATHA, KOCHI-1.
- 5. STANLY, S/O.JOSEPH, KATTIKKATTUTHAYYIL, FORTKOCHI VELI, CENTRE ODATHA, KOCHI-1.

W.P.(C) No.37879/2007

- 6. JOHN, S/O.JOSEPH, KATTIKKATTUTHAYYIL, FORTKOCHI VELI, CENTRE ODATHA, KOCHI-1.
- 7. ANTONY TOMY, KATTIKKATTUTHAYYIL, FORTKOCHI VELI, CENTRE ODATHA, KOCHI-1.

BY ADV. SRI.DINESH R.SHENOY FOR R3-7 SRI.V.V.UNNIKRISHNAN FOR R3-7 GOVERNMENT PLEADER, SRI.BENJAMIN PAUL.

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 11/08/2008, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

W.P.(C) No.37879/2007

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S EXTS:

EXT.P1: COPY OF COMPLAINT DT.11.12.2007 MADE BEFORE THE 1ST

RESPONDENT BY PETITIONERS.

EXT.P2: COPY OF RECEIPT DT.11.12.2007 ISSUED FROM THE OFFICE OF

THE 1ST RESPONDENT.

RESPONDENT'S EXTS:

EXT.R3(a): COPY OF THE NOTICE ISSUED BY THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,

WOMEN'S CELL, ERNAKULAM TO THE 3RD RESPONDENT.

//TRUE COPY//

PA TO JUDGE.

K. BALAKRISHNAN NAIR & M.C.HARI RANI, JJ.

W.P.(C). No.37879 OF 2007

Dated this the 11th day of August, 2008

JUDGMENT

Balakrishnan Nair, J.

The petitioners are sister and brother respectively. The respondents 3 to 6 are their direct brothers. The 7th respondent is the foster son of their parents. Though the 1st petitioner was married, her marital life did not last for more than two months. Thereafter, she has returned to her parental home and is residing with the respondents 3 to 7 there. The 2nd petitioner is residing in a different place. The petitioners submit, the 1st petitioner is being physically threatened and harassed by respondents 3 to 7 to compel her to relinguish her right in the family property in favour of the said respondents. Since the 2nd petitioner is supporting the 1st petitioner, he is also being threatened by them, it is submitted. In the above background, they filed Ext.P1 representation before the 1st respondent, seeking necessary protection to them. Alleging that the police did not take any effective action, this writ petition is filed.

- 2. The respondents 3 to 7 has filed a counter affidavit denying the allegations of the petitioners. According to them, the 2nd petitioner is behind the dispute and also behind this writ petition. The 1st petitioner is residing in the parental home and no one has any objection to her residing there. The 2nd petitioner has already been given his share in the family property and he is staying separately. Now, he wants a share in the balance family property. Therefore, he is putting the 1st petitioner before him and trying to rake up a non existing dispute regarding the property. There is, absolutely, no threat to him from the part of the party respondents. All the allegations are unfounded, it is submitted.
- 3. The learned Government Pleader, upon instructions, submitted that this is a family dispute and the police have no role to play in this.

4. The dispute regarding sharing of family property has to be settled by moving the competent civil court. We record the submission of respondents 3 to 7 that they have no intention, whatsoever, to physically harm or harass the petitioners.

Recording the above submission, this writ petition is disposed of.

(K.BALAKRISHNAN NAIR, JUDGE)

(M.C.HARI RANI, JUDGE)

ps