



WEB COPY



CRP.No.1289 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 20.11.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.SOUNTHAR

CRP.No.1289 of 2025 and
CMP.No.7694 and 7695 of 2025

1. N.S.Sivakumar
2. N.M.Soundarajan
3. Latha Bharathi
4. Uma Mageshwari

... Petitioners

Vs.

R.Rajalakshmi

...Respondent

PRAYER :Civil Revision Petition filed Article 227 of Constitution of India, praying to strike out the Complaint in DVC No. 36 of 2024 pending on the file of Judicial Magistrate, Ambattur, Chennai.

For Petitioners	: M/s.Y.Kajanavas
For Respondent	:M/s.M.Backiyalakshmi

ORDER

The civil revision petition has been filed to strike off the complaint preferred by the respondent/complainant under the provisions of Domestic Violence Act.

1/6



2. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that instant complaint has been filed by the respondent/wife when a petition for divorce based on mutual consent was pending before the competent court. Therefore, it is nothing but abuse process of law.

3. It is seen from the complaint that there are specific allegations of physical abuse against the petitioners.

4. Taking into consideration the specific allegations in the complaint, this Court is not inclined to go into the merits of the case. It is open to the petitioners to go before the learned Magistrate and raise all preliminary issues as held by the full bench of this Court in ***Arul Daniel and Others Versus Suganya reported in (2022) SCC Online Mad 5435.***

5. The Full Bench of this Court in the case of ***Arul Daniel and Others Versus Suganya reported in (2022) SCC Online Mad 5435*** held that any person aggrieved by the process issued by the Magistrate can go before the very same Magistrate and raise preliminary objections with regard to the issues like existence of a shared household/ domestic relationship etc., If any order is passed, the aggrieved person can also take recourse to an appeal under Section 29 of the Domestic Violence Act. The relevant portion 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.*

6. In view of the availability of alternative remedy before Magistrate, as held by Full Bench in **Arul Daniel** case, this Court is not inclined to exercise supervisory power under Article 227 of the Constitution of India. Further, the



CRP.No.1289 of 2025

Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of *Virudhunagar Nadargal Dharma*

Paripalana Shabha Vs Tuticorin Educational Society reported in

MANU/SC/1365/2019 held that availability of alternative remedy before regular Courts, is near total bar for exercise of supervisory power by High Court. Hence, I am not inclined to interfere in revision.

7. Accordingly, the Civil Revision petition stands dismissed with liberty to the petitioners to approach the concerned Magistrate for getting appropriate remedy in terms of order passed in *Arul Daniel* case cited supra.

8. Having regard to the fact the complaint preferred under Section 12 of Domestic Violence Act is predominantly civil in nature, this Court is inclined to dispense with the personal appearance of the petitioners before the learned Magistrate unless it is absolutely necessary. Accordingly, the CMP.No.7695 of 2025 is ordered and the connected CMP.No.7694 of 2025 is closed. No costs.

20.11.2025

Index : Yes / No

Internet : Yes / No

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

nr



CRP.No.1289 of 2023

To

WEB COPY

The Judicial Magistrate, Ambattur, Chennai.



WEB COPY



CRP.No.1289 of 2025
S.SOUNTHAR, J.

nr

CRP.No.1289 of 2025 and
CMP.No.7694 and 7695 of 2025

20.11.2025