



CRP(MD).No.2137 of 2021

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED : 30.11.2022

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE **B.PUGALENDHI**

CRP(MD)No.2137 of 2021
and
C.M.P(MD).Nos.11324 and 11323 of 2021

1.Innashi
2.I.Savariyammal
3.Antro Amaldass
4.A.Arul Christina Mary : Petitioners /Respondents 2 to 5

Vs.,

J.Reena Arutselvi : Respondent/Petitioner

PRAYER: Civil Revision Petition filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India to call for the records pertaining to the impugned order passed in DVOP.No.5 of 2020 on the file of the learned District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Athur, Dindigul District and quash the same as illegal.

For Petitioners : Mr.M.Marimuthu

For Respondent : Mr.A.Hariharan



CRP(MD).No.2137 of 2021

ORDER

WEB COPY

This Civil Revision Petition is filed against the proceedings initiated by the respondent herein in DVOP.No.5 of 2020 before the learned District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Athur, Dindigul District. The petitioners herein are respondents 2 to 5 in D.V.O.P.No.5 of 2020.

2. The Hon'ble Full Bench of this Court, in the reference made in Crl.O.P.SR.Nos.31852 of 2022, etc. (batch), dated 17.11.2022, has answered as follows:

“A petition under Article 227 of the Constitution may still be maintainable if it is shown that the proceedings before the Magistrate suffer from a patent lack of jurisdiction. The jurisdiction under Article 227 is one of superintendence and is visitorial in nature and will not be exercised unless there exists a clear jurisdictional error and that manifest or substantial injustice would be caused if the power is not exercised in favour of the petitioner. (See Abdul Razak v Mangesh Rajaram Wagle (2010) 2 SCC 432, Virudhunagar Hindu Nadargal Dharma Paribalana Sabai v Tuticorin Educational Society (2019) 9 SCC 538). In normal circumstances, the power under Article 227 will not be



WEB COPY



CRP(MD).No.2137 of 2021

exercised, as a measure of self-imposed restriction, in view of the corrective mechanism available to the aggrieved parties before the Magistrate, and then by way of an appeal under Section 29 of the Act.”

3. The Hon'ble Full Bench of this Court has also held that the personal appearance of the parties shall not be insisted upon, if the parties are effectively represented through a counsel. The relevant portion is extracted as under:

“iv. Personal appearance of the respondent(s) shall not be ordinarily insisted upon, if the parties are effectively represented through a counsel. Form VII of the D.V. Rules, 2006, makes it clear that the parties can appear before the Magistrate either in person or through a duly authorized counsel. In all cases, the personal appearance of relatives and other third parties to the domestic relationship shall be insisted only upon compelling reasons being shown. (See *Siladitya Basak v. State of West Bengal* (2009 SCC OnLine Cal 1903).”

4. This Civil Revision Petition is filed challenging the proceedings under the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act and not filed



CRP(MD).No.2137 of 2021

on the ground of lack of jurisdiction. Therefore, this Civil Revision Petition is not maintainable before this Court, as per the decision rendered by the Hon'ble Full Bench (cited supra). However, this Court is inclined to dispose of the Civil Revision Petition in the following terms:

(i) If the petitioners are having any grievance that they have been unnecessarily added as parties to the proceedings, it is open to them to file an application before the learned Magistrate to delete their names and if any such application is filed, the learned Magistrate shall decide the same, as per the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Kunapareddy v. Kunapareddy Swarna Kumari***, reported in **(2016) 11 SCC 774**.

(ii) If the petitioners are represented through a counsel, the learned Magistrate shall not insist on the personal appearance of the petitioners. However, the petitioners shall appear before the Court as and when their presence is required by the Court.

(iii) The learned Magistrate is directed to dispose of D.V.O.P.No.5 of 2020 as expeditiously as possible preferably within a period of four months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.



CRP(MD).No.2137 of 2021

WEB COPY

5. Accordingly, the Civil Revision Petition is disposed of. No costs.

Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

30.11.2022

Index : Yes / No

Internet : Yes / No

Rmk

To

The District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Athur, Dindigul District.



WEB COPY



CRP(MD).No.2137 of 2021

B.PUGALENDHI, J.

Rmk

CRP(MD)No.2137 of 2021

30.11.2022