

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS
DATED: 13.08.2019
CORAM
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P.VELMURUGAN
Crl.RC.No.1005 of 2015

Mr.Narpat Chand Lodha

.... Petitioner /Accused

vs.

Mrs.Mamta Narpat

.... Respondent/Complainant

Prayer: Criminal Revision is filed under Section 397(1) r/w 401 of Code of Criminal Procedure, to call for the records in respect of the order passed by the learned XV Additional Sessions Judge, Chennai, in Crl.A.No.301 of 2014 dated 20.07.2015 by confirming the order passed by the learned VIII Metropolitan Magistrate, George Town, Chennai, in Crl.M.P.No.2865 of 2014 in D.V.C.NO.16 of 2014 dated 28/10/2014 and set aside the same.

For Petitioner : Mr.AR.L.Sundaresan,
Senior Counsel for
M/s.S.Thiruvengadam
For Respondent : Mr.M.L.Joseph

ORDER

This Criminal Revision Case has been filed to call for the records in respect of the order passed by the learned XV Additional Sessions Judge, Chennai, in Crl.A.No.301 of 2014 dated 20.07.2015 by confirming the order passed by the learned VIII Metropolitan Magistrate, George Town, Chennai, in Crl.M.P.No.2865 of 2014 in D.V.C.NO.16 of 2014 dated and set aside the same.

2 Heard the learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner and the learned counsel for the respondent and perused the materials available on record.

3 It is stated by the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioner/husband that after passing an order of return of Sridhana Articles, all the articles available with the petitioner have been returned to the respondent/wife. But, still

the wife claims some of the items have not been returned. The petitioner/husband has stated that there is no such articles available as claimed by the respondent. What ever, the Sridhana Properties brought by the wife, are all returned to her and she has also acknowledged the same. Hence, the Criminal Revision Case is liable to be allowed.

4 Even though, the learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner/husband contended that all the sridhana articles available with him have been returned to the respondent/wife and she has also acknowledged the same, but according to the respondent/wife, some of the properties have not been returned and she seeks to return the same. This Court is of the view, insofar as return of properties are concerned, the parties can workout their remedy before the appropriate forum.

5 The Criminal Revision Case is disposed of and the parties are at liberty to work out their remedy before appropriate forum in accordance with law.

-s/d-
Assistant Registrar

True Copy
Sub-Assistant Registrar

sbn

To

1. The VIII Metropolitan Magistrate,
George Town, Chennai.
2. The XV Additional Sessions Judge, Chennai.

+2 cc to M/s.Chennai Law Association Advocate sr69084

Cr1.RC.No.1005 of 2015

rjl(co)
aa23/10/2019

WEB COPY