



Crl.R.C.No.182 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated: 14.02.2025

Coram:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE **P.VELMURUGAN**

Crl.R.C.No.182 of 2025

--

Renu

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1.State by Inspector of Police,
District Crime Branch,
Vellore.
(Crime No.22 of 2018)

2.Venkatesh

.. Respondents

Criminal Revision Case filed under Section 438 read with Section 442 of the BNSS, 2023, to set aside the order passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate at Gudiyattam in R.C.S.No.159 of 2019, dated 07.11.2020.

For petitioner : Mr.G.Mohammed Aseef

For respondent: Mr.Sugendran
Additional Public Prosecutor for R1

ORDER

This Criminal Revision Petition is filed to set aside the order passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate, Gudiyattam in R.C.S.No.159 of 2019, dated 07.11.2020.



Crl.R.C.No.182 of 2025

2. The petitioner filed a complaint before the respondent Police, which resulted in the registration of a case in Crime No.22 of 2018, dated 23.04.2018 against the second respondent. After the investigation, the respondent Police filed a closure report. Against which, the petitioner filed a protest petition. The learned Judge, after conducting an inquiry, dismissed the protest petition.

3. Challenging this dismissal, the petitioner has now approached this Court.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the accused forged the signature of the petitioner's father to obtain an electricity connection. He contends that the TNEB officials failed to produce the original disputed document, specifically the application in which the accused allegedly forged the father's signature. The learned counsel further argues that the Electricity Board officials and the accused were colluding with each other to protect the second respondent/accused. However, the learned Magistrate failed to properly consider the materials presented in the case and dismissed the petition, which warrants interference.

5. Heard the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent, on the above submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner.



Crl.R.C.No.182 of 2025

6. Upon perusal of the records, it appears that, apart from the petitioner's statement in the complaint, no material evidence supports the claim that the father's signature was forged. The petitioner's sisters have deposed that the mother signed on behalf of the father and submitted the documents to the Electricity Department. The Investigating Officer examined the officer and confirmed that no records were available from the Electricity Department regarding the application or any documents containing the alleged forged signature. Consequently, the Investigating Officer closed the case, stating they were unable to identify the person responsible for forging the documents. In the absence of sufficient material evidence, particulars, or witnesses to substantiate the claim, and considering the statements from the petitioner's siblings that the mother signed the documents on behalf of the father, the learned Magistrate dismissed the protest petition after considering all available materials. The petitioner has failed to produce any additional material to challenge the findings of the investigation.

7. Therefore, this Court finds no merit in the criminal revision, and the same is dismissed. However, the petitioner is at liberty to pursue any remedy related to the rights and entitlements concerning the property before the appropriate civil Court.

14.02.2025

r n s

Index : Yes/No

Neutral Citation Case : Yes/No

Speaking Order : Yes/No



Crl.R.C.No.182 of 2025

To

1. The Judicial Magistrate
Gudiyattam.
2. The Inspector of Police,
District Crime Branch,

Vellore.
3. The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court, Chennai.



WEB COPY



Crl.R.C.No.182 of 2025

P.VELMURUGAN, J

r n s

Crl.R.C.No.182 of 2025

14.02.2025