



WEB COPY

CRL MP No. 12792 of 2025

CRL OP NO. 34594 OF 2019



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 07-01-2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE M. NIRMAL KUMAR

CRL MP No. 12792 of 2025

IN

CRL OP NO. 34594 OF 2019

Rosy Sesuraj
W/o.Sesuraj, Flat No.75, Gandhi Raod,
Choolaimedu, Chennai-94.

Petitioner/De facto
complainant

Vs

1. E.Betsy
W/o.Thomas Pari Mannan, No.7/8,
Thomas Nagar, Little Mount, Saidapet,
Chennai-15.

2.The State Rep By,
The Inspector of Police,
AWPS, Mylapore Police Station,
Chennai.

Respondent(s)

CRL OP No. 34594 of 2019

E.Betsy
W/o.Thomas Pari Mannan, No.7/8,
Thomas Nagar, Little Mount, Saidapet,
Chennai-15.

Petitioner/A2

Vs

1. The State Rep. By
Inspector Of Police, Awps, Mylapore



Police Station, Chennai.

2.xxxxx

W/O.SESURAJ, FLAT NO.75,
GANDHI ROAD, CHOOLAIMEDU,
CHENNAI-94. (R2 and her daughter's
name amended as per the order dated
08.07.2025 in Crl.MP.No.12792 of
2025 in Crl.OP.No.34594 of 2019)

Respondent(s)

For Petitioner : Mr.B.Vijayakumar
for Mr.R.Babu
For Respondent-1: Mr.Aadeish, J.B.
For Respondent-2 : Mr.S.Udayakumar
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

ORDER

Today, the case is listed today under the caption 'For Clarification'.

2.The first respondent/A2 had filed a quash application before this Court in Crl.O.P.No.34594 of 2019 seeking to quash the F.I.R. in Crime No.12 of 2019. This Court, by an order dated 23.01.2023 quashed the case as against the first respondent herein.

3.The de facto complainant/petitioner herein filed Crl.M.P.No.12792 of 2022 seeking to replace the name of de facto complainant and her daughter with "xxxxx" in the order dated 23.01.2023 in Crl.O.P.No.34594 of 2019. This Court, by an order dated 08.07.2025 allowed the said petition. In the said order, the date of order passed in quash petition has been inadvertently typed as



‘23.01.2025’ instead of ‘23.01.2023’. Further, the de facto complainant and her daughter’s name to be replaced with “xxxxx” in the order dated 23.01.2023.

WEB COPY

4.Today, the learned counsel for petitioner as well learned counsel for first respondent and the learned Government Advocate for second respondent are present.

5.The learned counsel for the first respondent/A2 has got objection in substituting the name of de facto complainant and her daughter with “xxxxx”. On the other hand, the learned Government Advocate for the second respondent has no objection for the same.

6.In view of the above, the paragraph 3 of the order dated 08.07.2025 is substituted as follows:

“3. Considering the submissions of both sides and in view of the averments adduced in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, this petition is ordered. The Registry is directed to substitute the name of de facto complainant and her daughter with “xxxxx” in the order dated 23.01.2023 and issue a fresh copy of the order dated 23.01.2023.”



WEB COPY

CRL MP No. 12792 of 2025



CRL OP NO. 34594 OF 2019

M. NIRMAL KUMAR, J.

rsi

7. Registry is further directed to correct the order date '23.01.2025' as '23.01.2023' wherever it reflects in the order dated 08.07.2025.

8. The issue is clarified accordingly.

07.01.2026

rsi

To

1. The Inspector of Police,
AWPS, Mylapore Police Station,
Chennai.

2. The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Madras.

**CRL MP No. 12792 of 2025
IN
CRL OP NO. 34594 OF 2019**