



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

**DATED: 12-11-2025**

CORAM

**THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE T.V.THAMILSELVI**

**CRL RC No. 1920 of 2025**

J.Andal

Petitioner

Vs

State by  
Inspector of Police (Law and Order),  
T15 Selaiyur Police Station,  
Selaiyur, Chennai-600 073.  
(Crime No. 245 of 2022)

Respondent

**CRL RC No. 1920 of 2025**

**PRAYER**

To call for the records in CrI.M.P.No.1917 of 2024 in C.C.No. 388 of 2022 passed by the Judicial Magistrate No.II, Tambaram and set aside the same.

For Petitioner: Mr.T.Sundaravadanam

For Respondent: Dr.C.E.Pratap,  
Govt. Advocate (Crl. Side)



## **ORDER**

Challenging the impugned order passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Tambaram in Crl.M.P.No.1917 of 2024 in C.C.No. 388 of 2022, the petitioner/defacto complainant preferred this Criminal Revision Petition.

2. Before the trial court, the petitioner had filed a petition to implead four persons, who were said to be proposed accused as if they have also threatened him at the time of alleged occurrence. The said petition was dismissed by the trial court holding that no material evidence was putforth by the defacto complainant against proposed accused said to be present on the date of alleged occurrence on 09.05.2022. Aggrieved that order, the present Criminal Revision Case has been filed.

3. The learned counsel for petitioner would submit that at the time of alleged occurrence, the officials of 1<sup>st</sup> accused Kinaru Capital came to the house and ransacked the house and attacked her husband Jayapal and also abused the defacto complainant. To that effect, she gave a complaint. He would also submit that the petitioner came to know that all the proposed accused entered into her house as per the direction given by the officials of finance company like CEO



and other officials, who were in Bangalore. Therefore, he prayed to implead three persons as proposed accused, but the trial judge has failed to consider the same, without which, the trial is not fare one. But, the prosecution raised objections stating that at the time of lodging the F.I.R., the defacto complainant has specifically mentioned that four persons were entered into house and ransacked, but subsequently, to develop the theory, he wanted to implead CEO, official of finance company as such is not acceptable one and the trial court has rightly disagreed with the claim of petitioner, which needs no interference.

4. Considering both side submissions, the fact reveals that at the time of lodging the complaint, she gave a complaint against four persons as unknown persons. Based on that, F.I.R. was filed and final report was also filed against four accused. Now, the defacto complainant wanted to include the officials of Kinaru Capital viz., CEO, CFO and COO, who said to have given instructions to those persons to ransack the house of defacto complainant. To support that contentions, there is no prima facie materials produced on the side of defacto complainant nor no reason was assigned for the said long delay to approach the court to implead them as rightly observed by the trial judge. Without any



incriminating materials, the proposed accused cannot be prosecuted. Therefore,

I do not find any illegality and infirmity in the order passed by the trial court.

Accordingly, this Criminal Revision Case is dismissed as no merit. However,

liberty is granted to the petitioner to call for those persons to examine on her

side by issuing summons.

**12-11-2025**

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

rpp

To

Judicial Magistrate No.II, Tambaram.



WEB COPY

CRL RC No. 1920 of 2025



**T.V.THAMILSELVI J.**

rpp

**CRL RC No. 1920 of  
2025**

**12-11-2025**