

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated : 28.07.2016

Coram

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE G.CHOCKALINGAM

Crl.R.C.No.1484 of 2011

K.Madhana Devi

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1.State rep by the
Inspector of Police,
W15, All Women Police Station,
Royapuram, Chennai-13.

2.R.Karthikeyan

.. Respondents

Prayer :- Criminal Revision Petition filed under Section 397 r/w 401 of Cr.P.C. against the judgment and order of acquittal of some charges under Sections 323, 506(ii), 471, 468, 420 and 406 IPC and conviction under Section 498(a) IPC passed by the learned XVI Metropolitan Magistrate, George Town, Chennai in CC.No.6641 of 2008 dated 17.08.2011.

For Petitioner : ***Mr.L.Baskaran**
For Respondents : Mr.M.Mohammed Riyaz
GA (Crl. Side) for R1.
Service awaited for R2.

ORDER

The criminal revision petition is directed against the judgment passed by the XVI Metropolitan Magistrate, George Town, Chennai CC.No.6641 of 2008 dated 17.08.2011, for conviction of sentence to undergo simple imprisonment for one year and pay a fine of Rs.2000/- in default to undergo simple imprisonment for a period of one month.

2.The learned counsel for the petitioner would contend that the criminal revision would lie before this Court against the order of conviction of the accused by the learned XVI Metropolitan Magistrate, George Town, Chennai in CC.No.6641 of 2008 as against the complaint given by the defacto complainant/revision petitioner.

3.In the above said circumstances, it is useful to extract Sections 372 and 374 Cr.PC which read as follows :-

"372. No appeal to lie unless otherwise provided - No appeal shall lie from any judgment or order of a Criminal Court except as provided for by this Code or by any other law for the time being in force.

[Provided that the victim shall have a right to prefer an appeal against any order passed by the Court acquitting the accused or convicting for a lesser offence or imposing inadequate compensation, and such appeal shall lie to the Court to which an appeal ordinarily lies against the order of conviction of such Court.]

Amendment Act, 2008 - Clause 29 amends Section 372 of the Code relating to appeals from judgment or order of a Criminal Court it gives to the victim the right to prefer an appeal against any adverse order passed by the trial Court (Notes on Clauses).

374. Appeals from convictions -

(1) Any person convicted on a trial held by a High Court in its extraordinary original criminal jurisdiction may appeal to the Supreme Court.

(2) Any person convicted on a trial held by a Sessions Judge or an Additional Sessions Judge or on a trial held by any other Court in which a sentence of imprisonment for more than seven years has been passed against him or against any other person convicted at the same trial; may appeal to the High Court.

(3) Save as otherwise provided in sub-section (2), any person,-

(a) convicted on a trial held by a Metropolitan Magistrate or Assistant Sessions Judge or Magistrate of the first class or of the second class, or

(b) sentenced under section 325, or

(c) in respect of whom an order has been made or a sentence has been passed under section 360 by any Magistrate, may appeal to the Court of Session."

4. In view of the above said provisions, the person convicted before the trial court/Assistant Sessions Judge has right to file appeal before the Sessions Judge and also in the case of acquittal, the appeal shall lie before the appellate Court to which the appeal ordinarily lie, the appeal has to be necessarily preferred before the concerned Sessions Court.

5. Aggrieved over the said order passed by the learned XVI Metropolitan Magistrate, George Town, Chennai, the present

revision is preferred by the revision petitioner. The revision petitioner has every right to prefer an appeal before the Sessions Judge of the concerned District. If the petitioner is aggrieved over the order of the learned XVI Metropolitan Magistrate, George Town, Chennai, she has to prefer an appeal before the concerned Court and without following the above said procedure, the petitioner, straightaway, filed the revision petition before this Court which is not at all maintainable and the revision is liable to be dismissed.

6.In the result, the criminal revision petition stands dismissed, with liberty to the petitioner to approach the competent court in accordance with law.

-s/d-

Assistant Registrar

***Corrected as per letter
dated 23/11/2016 and made in
Cr1.RC.No.1484/2011**

-s/d-

**Assistant Registrar(CSVII)
dt:25/11/2016**

True Copy

Sub-Assistant Registrar

tsh

To

1.The XVI Metropolitan Magistrate, (To be Substituted to the
George Town, Chennai. (order already despatched on
(06/09/2016 and made herein)

2.The Inspector of Police
W15 All Women Police Station
Royapuram
Chennai-13

3.The Public Prosecutor High Court Madras


copy to:

The Section Officer,
Criminal Section High Court Madras

+1 cc to Mr.L..Baskaran Advocate sr.42732/16

Cr1.R.C.No.1484 of 2011

ak(co)
aa11/08/2016
ug(co)
aa25/11/2016



WEB COPY