



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BECHU KURIAN THOMAS

TUESDAY, THE 14TH DAY OF JULY 2026 / 23RD ASHADHA, 1948

WP(C) NO. 18607 OF 2026

PETITIONERS :

1 MUBINA MUHAMED K.M.
AGED 37 YEARS
D/O MUHAMED K.A.,
KOLLIYIL HOUSE,
EDAVANAKKAD P.O.,
ERNAKULAM DISTRICT,
PIN - 682502

2 MOHAMMED K.A
AGED 64 YEARS
S/O ALI KUNJU,
KOLLIYL HOUSE,
EDAVANAKKAD P.O.,
ERNAKULAM DISTRICT,
PIN - 682502

BY ADVS.
SRI.K.I.ABDUL RASHEED
SMT.DEEPA SASIDHARAN

RESPONDENTS :

1 STATE OF KERALA
REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETARY,
DEPARTMENT OF HOME AFFAIRS,



2026:KER:52492

THIRUVANATHAPURAM,
PIN - 695001

2 THE SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE
OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE
(THRISSUR RUAL), KATTUNGACHIRA,
IRINJALAKUDA NORTH,
PORATHISSERRY, THRISSUR DISTRICT,
PIN - 680125

3 THE STATION HOUSE OFFICER
MALA POLICE STATION, MALA,
THRISSUR DISTRICT,
PIN - 680732

SMT. LAYA MARY JOSEPH, GOVERNMENT PLEADER

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 14.07.2026, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:



BECHU KURIAN THOMAS, J.

W.P.(C) No.18607 of 2026

Dated this the 14th day of July, 2026

JUDGMENT

Petitioners allege that the 3rd respondent has been harrassing them by compelling their appearance before the police station without any basis. They seek a direction for protecting their personal liberty and also not to insist on their appearance before the police station.

2. The learned Government Pleader, upon instructions submitted that a complaint had been received by the 3rd respondent from Smt.Khadeeja, based on which, petitioners were contacted as part of the required inquiry.

3. As the petitioners were contacted by the 3rd respondent pursuant to a complaint, necessarily it was part of the duty of a police officer, which cannot be categorized as harrassment. Hence, I am of the view that the petitioners ought to participate in the inquiry into the complaint by the police.



4. The learned counsel for the petitioners also submitted that though petitioners are willing to appear before the police as and when required, they apprehend that they will be threatened and compelled to arrive at a settlement with the complainant.

5. Considering the nature of submissions and the pleadings in the writ petition, this Court is of the view that, as long as the 3rd respondent confines himself within the duties as a police officer, the same cannot be termed as a harrassment. However, as the existence of a complaint cannot be used by the police to compel the opposite parties to settle or abide by any demands of the complainant, such action or conduct cannot be resorted to under the guise of any inquiry.

With the above observations, this writ petition is closed, reserving the liberty of the petitioners to approach this Court again in case of any harrassment.

Sd/-

BECHU KURIAN THOMAS, JUDGE

RKM



APPENDIX OF WP(C) NO. 18607 OF 2026

PETITIONERS' EXHIBITS :

Exhibit P1	TRUE PHOTOGRAPH SHOWING THE INJURIES CAUSED TO THE 1ST PETITIONER
Exhibit P2	TRUE PHOTOGRAPH SHOWING THE INJURIES SUSTAINED BY THE 1ST PETITIONER