



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 09.02.2021

WEB COPY

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE **Mrs. JUSTICE R. HEMALATHA**

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.11377 of 2018

and

Crl.M.P(MD).Nos.5173 and 5174 of 2018

1.V.Ramesh
2.P.Veeranan @ Veerasamy
3.Nagarathinam ... Petitioners

Vs.

1.R.Suganthi
2.Minor.R.Sanjay
3.Minor.Harish
(Respondents Minor 2 and 3 are rep., by
the natural guardian of their mother namely R.Suganthi)
... Respondents

Prayer : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure to quash the proceedings in DVC.No.4 of 2018 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Bodinaickanur.

For Petitioner : Mr.C.M.Arumugam
For Respondent No.1 : Mr.K.Navaneetharaja

ORDER

The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure seeking to quash the proceedings in DVC.No.4 of 2018 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Bodinaickanur.

2.The petitioners are the respondents 1 to 3 in DVC.No.4 of 2018 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Bodinaickanur. The case of the petitioners is that the first respondent without any basis has filed a complaint under the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005 and that the Magistrate has also taken cognizance against all the petitioners on the complaint filed by the first respondent.

3.In the decision in Crl.OP.No.28458 of 2019 batch, a Hon'ble Single Judge of this Court vide orders dated 18.01.2021 after surveying various Supreme Court Decisions had clearly held that quashing the proceedings under Section 12 of the Protection of Women



from Domestic Violence Act, 2005 is not maintainable under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. He has further held that a petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India alone would be maintainable if it is shown that the proceedings before the Magistrate suffer from a patent lack of jurisdiction. The relevant paragraph is extracted hereunder:

"50. It follows that in view of the law laid down in S.A.L Narayan Row and Another vs. Ishwarlal Bhagwandas reported in AIR 1965 SC 1818 and Ram Kishan Fauji vs. State of Haryana reported in (2017) 5 SCC 533, that the character of a proceeding under the D.V Act, in so far as it relates to the reliefs under Sections 18 to 23, does not become criminal in character merely on account of the procedure under the Cr.P.C adopted by the Magistrate. In view of the foregoing discussion, the inevitable conclusion is that a petition to quash an application under Section 12 of the D.V. Act is maintainable only by way of a petition under Article 227 of the Constitution and not under Section 482, Cr.P.C."

4.Applying the same analogy, the present Criminal Original Petition is dismissed and if the petitioners are aggrieved by the orders passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate, Bodinaickanur, they can file a petition under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, but definitely not under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure including the question of limitation within which Domestic Violence Original Petition can be filed by the aggrieved person. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petitions are closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CS-III)

// True Copy //

/ /2021

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

Note: In view of the present lock down owing to COVID-19 pandemic, a web copy of the order may be utilized for official purposes, but, ensuring that the copy of the order that is presented is the correct copy, shall be the responsibility of the advocate/litigant concerned.



To

1.The Judicial Magistrate, Bodinaickanur.

2.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

+1 CC to Mr.C.M.ARUMUGAM, Advocate (SR-4362[F] dated 10/02/2021)

CrI.O.P. (MD) No.11377 of 2018

09.02.2021

(KUN)

KV(26.02.2021) 3P 4C