

**Crl.MP.Nos.7098 to 7100 of 2016
in Crl.RC.No.874, 877 and 875 of 2016**

G.CHOCKALINGAM, J.

These Petitions have been filed by the petitioner to implead the petitioner/proposed second respondent in all the criminal revision.

2.The learned counsel for the petitioner would contend that the present petitioner is the defacto complainant in all the cases. The revision filed by the revision petitioners/accused 2, 3 and 4/Subramanian, Sankari and Damodharan respectively against the order passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate, Tambaram in CMP.No.316 to 318 of 2015 in CC.No.427 of 2015 dismissing the application filed by the petitioners. The petitioner/defacto complainant may be given a chance to put forth the case and she is well acquainted with the facts of the present case. Hence, she may be impleaded as second respondent in the criminal revision and prays to allow the petitions.

3.Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned counsel for the first respondents/revision petitioners has no objection in allowing these petitions.

4.Considering the facts and circumstances, to give an opportunity to the petitioner to contest the revision, this court is inclined to implead the petitioner as second respondent in all the criminal revision.

G.CHOCKALINGAM, J.
tsh

5.In the result, all the petitions are allowed by impleading the petitioner as second respondent in all the criminal revisions. Registry is directed to carry out suitable amendment in the cause title and post the main revision.

6.Post the main revision on 07.09.2016.

17.08.2016.

**Crl.MP.Nos.7098 to 7100 of 2016
in Crl.RC.Nos.874, 877 and 875 of 2016**