

CrI.O.P. No. 25269 of 2018

Mansur Rahman v. Superintendent of Police

2018 SCC OnLine Mad 3250

In the High Court of Madras  
(BEFORE P.N. PRAKASH, J.)

Mansur Rahman ..... Petitioner;  
v.

1. The Superintendent of Police, Coimbatore District.
2. The Inspector of Police, Pollachi Police Station, Pollachi, Coimbatore District ..... Respondents.

CrI.O.P. No. 25269 of 2018  
Decided on October 30, 2018

For Petitioner: Mr. K.T.S. Sivakumar

For Respondents: Mr. C. Raghavan, Govt. Advocate

Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C., praying to issue a direction, directing the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent to consider the petitioner's complaint dated 08.10.2018 and 09.10.2018 and to give police protection to the petitioner and his wife.

#### ORDER

P.N. PRAKASH, J.:— It is the case of the petitioner that he was in love with Janifer, a transgender, elder to him in age and got married to her on 25.07.2018 and that the petitioner's parents and some persons belonging to a political outfit are harassing the petitioner and are threatening him. Therefore, the petitioner is before this Court, seeking police protection.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Government Advocate (CrI. Side) for the respondents.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner took this Court through the photographs showing the marriage between the petitioner and the said Janifer. This Court places on record its profound appreciation to the petitioner for his courage in coming forward to marry a transgender. In *Lata Singh v. State of Uttar Pradesh* [(2006) 5 SCC 475], the Hon'ble Supreme Court has stated that the instrumentalities of the State should encourage inter-caste and inter-religious marriage and give the couples sufficient police protection. This Court is of the view that, to the said list, the marriage with transgender also deserves to be included for police protection. Accordingly, this Court directs the petitioner to submit a representation to the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent and on such representation being given, the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent is directed to conduct enquiry and ensure that no harm befalls the petitioner and his wife.

4. With the above direction, this petition is closed.