



WEB COPY

CRP No.759 of 2025



DATED: 19-11-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S. SOUNTHAR

**CRP No.759 of 2025 and
CMP No.4329 and 4330 of 2025**

1. Arun Kumar
2 . Sargunam
3. Jaishankar

... Petitioner(s)

Vs.

Suganthi

... Respondent(s)

PRAYER: Civil Revision Petition filed under Article 227 of Constitution of India to call for the records in pursuance to the DVC No.20 of 2024 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate, Additional Mahila Court, Vellore, Vellore District and quash the same.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.M.Sathishkumar

For Respondent(s) : Mr.Y.Kajanivas

ORDER



This civil revision petition is filed challenging the complaint preferred by the respondent/wife under the provisions of the Domestic Violence Act.

WEB COPY

2. The first petitioner is husband of the respondent. The 2nd petitioner is mother in-law and 3rd petitioner is brother in-law of the respondent. The petitioners filed this civil revision petition seeking to strike off their name, mainly on the ground that the allegations made in the complaint are false and the same are not sufficient to take cognizance by the Magistrate to invoke the provisions under Domestic Violence Act.

3. In view of the Law settled by this Court in *Arul Daniel and Others Versus Suganya* reported in (2022) SCC Online Mad 5435, if the petitioners are aggrieved by the initiation of the proceedings under the Domestic Violence Act, it is for them to move the very same Magistrate raising preliminary issues. The relevant observation of Full Bench reads as follows:-



WEB COPY

87(vii). *As there is no issuance of process as contemplated under Section 204, Cr.P.C. in a proceeding under the D.V. Act, the principle laid down in Adalat Prasad v. Rooplal Jindal ((2004) 7 SCC 338) that a process, under Section 204, Cr.P.C, once issued cannot be reviewed or recalled, will not apply to a proceeding under the D.V. Act. Consequently, it would be open to an aggrieved respondent (s) to approach the Magistrate and raise the issue of maintainability and other preliminary issues. Issues like the existence of a shared household/domestic relationship etc., which form the jurisdictional basis for entertaining an application under Section 12, can be determined as a preliminary issue, in appropriate cases. Any person aggrieved by such an order may also take recourse to an appeal under Section 29 of the D.V. Act for effective redress (See V.K. Vijayalekshmi Amma v. Bindu V., (2010) 87 AIC 367). This would stem the deluge of petitions challenging the maintainability of an application under Section 12 of the D.V. Act, at the threshold before this Court under Article 227 of the Constitution.*

Hence, this court is not inclined to exercise its Supervisory Power available under Article 227 of Constitution of India to strike off the complaint.



WEB COPY

4. Accordingly, this civil revision petition is dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs. Connected miscellaneous petitions are closed. The petitioners is at liberty to move the concerned Magistrate for getting appropriate remedy as per law laid down in *Arul Daniel case*.

5. Taking into consideration the proceedings initiated before learned Magistrate is predominantly civil in nature, the personal appearance of the petitioners during enquiry before Magistrate is dispensed with, unless their personal appearance is absolutely necessary.

19.11.2025

Internet: yes

Index: Yes/No

Neutral citation: Yes/No

MST

To

The Judicial Magistrate Additional Mahila Court,
Vellore.



WEB COPY

CRP No.759 of 2018





WEB COPY

CRP No.759 of 2



S.SOUNTHAR, J.

MST

CRP No.759 of 2025



WEB COPY

CRP No.759 of 2



19.11.2025