



C.R.P(MD)No.2987 of 2024

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED : 29.11.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE Mr. JUSTICE G.ILANGO VAN

C.R.P(MD)No.2987 of 2024

and

C.M.P(MD)Nos.17117, 17118 and 17120 of 2024

1.Swaminathan

2.Mallika

3.Nainar

... Petitioners / Respondents

Vs

S.Saranya

... Respondent / Petitioner

Prayer : This Civil Revision Petition is filed under Article 227 of Constitution of India, to call for records in D.V.C.No.25 of 2021 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate Court - IV, Tirunelveli and to quash the same as against the petitioners.

For Petitioner : Mr.SC.Herold Singh

ORDER

This Civil Revision Petition is filed to call for records in



C.R.P(MD)No.2987 of 2024

D.V.C.No.25 of 2021 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate Court - IV,
Tirunelveli and to quash the same as against the petitioners.

2. A batch of matters were disposed of by this Court by making the following observations:

Let me extract the relevant portion of the judgment reported in the case of **Arul Danial Vs. Suganya (2022(3)MWN (CR.) 539 (FB) :-**

"7.The Division Bench, in *P.Ganesan*, supra, has categorically and correctly restated the legal position, in two places that the proceedings under the *D.V. Act* are civil in nature. For the sake of convenience, we are extracting those portions from *P. Ganesan*, supra.

"15 (o) To sum up:

(i) As we have already held that the proceedings under the *Domestic Violence Act* are civil in nature.....

16 (c) We have already held that the proceedings under *Chapter IV of the Domestic Violence Act* are civil in nature....."



WEB COPY



C.R.P(MD)No.2987 of 2024

8.We concur with the above view of Anand Venkatesh, J., as affirmed by the Division Bench in *P.Ganesan*, supra. However, after saying so, the Division Bench, in *P.Ganesan*, supra, found itself in disagreement with the opinion of Anand Venkatesh, J. that a petition under *Section 482 Cr.P.C.* to quash a D.V. proceedings is not maintainable and has given a contrary opinion which is as under:

"N.Anand Venkatesh, J. held that the Magistrate while adjudicating Civil rights cannot be called Criminal Court. We do not agree with this view of the learned Judge, firstly because the Parliament intended to deliberately confer Jurisdiction on the Criminal Court. An appeal is also provided to the Court of Sessions and not to the District Judge. Secondly, the learned Judge relied upon a number of cases to hold that where the Magistrate is conferred power to grant reliefs of Civil nature he cannot be called to a 'Criminal Court'. We find that in all the Judgments referred by the learned Judge, the Courts have held that



WEB COPY



C.R.P(MD)No.2987 of 2024

the Magistrate was not a Court when he was exercising Ministerial/Administrative functions and not a criminal Court when he was following the procedure stipulated under the [Special Act](#) which gave his power and not under [Cr.P.C.](#). Therefore, in our view those Judgments cannot be relied upon to hold that the Magistrate is not a criminal Court while dealing with an Application under 12 of the [Domestic Violence Act](#). Just as we found that the nature of reliefs would determine the character of the proceedings we find that the nature of the procedure adopted would determine the character of the Tribunal. There is no doubt that the Magistrate dealing with proceedings under [Domestic Violence Act](#) is a Criminal Court who has to follow the procedure under [Cr.P.C.](#), exception being provided under [Section 28 \(2\)](#) of the Act.” (emphasis supplied)

9.From a reading of the aforesaid, we are able to infer that albeit the



C.R.P(MD)No.2987 of 2024

fact that D.V. proceedings initiated on an application under [Section 12](#) are civil proceedings, the Magistrate is nonetheless a Criminal Court as the procedure he is required to follow is one under the [Code of Criminal Procedure](#). To put it more precisely, according to the Division Bench, it is not the substantive law, but the procedural law that determines the character of the Court of the Magistrate. This is where, in our considered opinion, with due respect, the Division Bench appears to have fallen in error."

3. Similarly regarding the appearance of the parties before the trial court, para (iv) may be extracted herein:-

"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



WEB COPY



C.R.P(MD)No.2987 of 2024

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. In the light of the above said statement of law, now we will go to the another aspect.

5. As stated in the Full Court Judgement, even though, petition under section 482 of Cr.P.C will not lie, Article 227 of the Constitution of India can be invoked on a specific plea and circumstances.

6.Let me extract the relevant portion:-

"xiv.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



WEB COPY



C.R.P(MD)No.2987 of 2024

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 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."

7.In the light of the statement of law, it is submitted that now this civil revision petition has been filed by the petitioners.

8.Now we shall examine as to whether the petitioners satisfied the requirement of law namely;-

(i)whether the cognizance taken by the Judicial Magistrate is



C.R.P(MD)No.2987 of 2024

WEB COPY

- illegal, because of the patent lack of jurisdiction;
- (ii) Whether there is any error in jurisdiction; and
- (iii) Whether there is any manifest or substantial injustice.

9. Now what is meant by jurisdictional error has also been elaborately discussed in the judgment. Let me extract the relevant portions:-

*"25.At this juncture, it is necessary to notice that the word "jurisdiction" relates to the power of the Court to decide a class or classes of cases. The import of the expression has been considered by the Supreme Court in **Nusli Neville Wadia Vs. Ivory Properties, 2020(6)SCC 557**, wherein, it was observed as under:-*

"The word "jurisdiction" is derived from Latin words "juris" and "dico", meaning "I speak by the law" and does not relate to rights of parties as between each other but to the power of



WEB COPY



C.R.P(MD)No.2987 of 2024

the court. Jurisdiction relates to a class of cases to which a particular case belongs. Jurisdiction is the authority by which a judicial officer takes cognizance and decides the cases. It only presupposes the existence of a duly constituted court having control over subject-matter which comes within classification limits of the law under which court has been established. It should have control over the parties' litigant, control over the parties' territory, it may also relate to pecuniary as well as the nature of the class of cases. Jurisdiction is generally understood as the authority to decide, render a judgment, inquire into the facts, to apply the law, and to pronounce a judgment. When there is the want of general power to act, the court has no jurisdiction. When the court has the power to inquire into the facts, apply the law, render binding judgment,



WEB COPY



C.R.P(MD)No.2987 of 2024

and enforce it, the court has jurisdiction. Judgment within a jurisdiction has to be immune from collateral attack on the ground of nullity. It has co-relation with the constitutional and statutory power of tribunal or court to hear and determine. It means the power or capacity fundamentally to entertain, hear, and determine." (emphasis supplied)

26. In view of the above, the power of the Magistrate to entertain and decide an Application under Section 12 and grant one or more reliefs under the D.V. Act is an aspect of his jurisdiction. It is settled law that jurisdiction is an issue that belongs to the realm of substantive law. Procedural law, on the other hand, prescribes the mode and manner in which such jurisdiction is to be exercised. A character of the Court is an essential aspect of its substantive jurisdiction,



WEB COPY



C.R.P(MD)No.2987 of 2024

*and would depend on the nature or
subject matter of the case before it.*

10. Reading of the cause of action mentioned by the respondent herein in the above, does indicate that learned Judicial Magistrate No.IV, Tirunelveli, has got jurisdiction to entertain the petition.

11. Now coming to the second issue, as to whether any manifest or substantial injustice occasioned to the petitioners, in the ground, it has been stated nothing about the particular ingredient. They have stated only the factual aspect, stating that after getting notice in H.M.O.P.No. 100 of 2023, the subject petition was filed. Whether there was no harassment or not, is a matter for trial and consideration by the concerned Courts. So no ground is also made out in respect of this particular ingredient. So I find that the petition has been filed under wrong or misconception of facts and law. It is not permissible. The petitioners are at liberty to work out remedy before the concerned Court only, as indicated in the judgment.



C.R.P(MD)No.2987 of 2024

12. With the above liberty, this Civil Revision Petition is disposed of. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

29.11.2024

NCC :Yes/No
Index :Yes/No
Internet : Yes/ No

pnn

To

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate Court - IV, Tirunelveli.
- 2.The Section Officer, VR Section,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



C.R.P(MD)No.2987 of 2024

G.ILANGO VAN, J.

pnn

ORDER
IN
C.R.P(MD)No.2987 of 2024
and
C.M.P(MD)Nos.17117, 17118 and 17120 of 2024

29.11.2024