



WEB COPY

CRP No.940 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 11-12-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S. SOUNTHAR

**CRP No. 940 of 2024 and
CMP Nos.4725 and 4726 of 2024**

1. SATHIYARAJ

S/o. (Late) Murugan No. 25,
Chinnaputhur, Pennathurai Post,
Kilkothur, Ananicut Taluk,
Vellore District.

2. Senthamarai

W/o. (Late) Murugan No. 25,
Chinnaputhur, Pennathurai Post,
Kilkothur, Ananicut Taluk,
Vellore District.

3. Manikandan

S/o. (Late) Murugan No. 25,
Chinnaputhur, Pennathurai Post,
Kilkothur, Ananicut Taluk,
Vellore District.

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. LAKSHMI

W/o. Sathiya Raj No. 228, Pillaiyar
Koil St, Karugambathur Village and
Post, Vellore Taluk, Vellore Dist.

Respondent(s)

PRAYER: Civil Revision Petition filed under Article 227 of Constitution of India to call for the entire records pursuant to the D.V.C. No. 17 OF 2023 on the file of Additional Mahila Court, Vellore, Vellore Dist.

For Petitioner(s): Mr. M.Sathish Kumar

For Respondent(s): Mr. G.Vinodh Kumar



ORDER

This civil revision petition is filed seeking to quash the complaint in DVC No.17 of 2023 preferred by the respondent against the petitioners under the provisions of the Domestic Violence Act.

2. The first petitioner is husband of respondent and the petitioners 2 and 3 are mother and brother of first petitioner respectively. The respondent filed the above said complaint on the file of Additional Mahila Court, Vellore against the petitioners.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the allegations made in complaint are very vague and hence, the Magistrate ought not to have issued process to the petitioners.

4. 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:-



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.

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



6. 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.

11.12.2025

Internet: yes
Index: Yes/No
Neutral citation: Yes/No
MST

To

The Additional Mahila Court, Vellore,
Vellore District.



WEB COPY

CRP No.940 of 2



S.SOUNTHAR, J.

MST

CRP No.940 of 2024

11.12.2025