



WEB COPY

CRP No.4152 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 03-12-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S. SOUNTHAR

**CRP No. 4152 of 2025 and
CMP Nos.21347 and 21348 of 2025**

1. DILIPAN

S/o. Sankaran, Srivari Scans, 23/26,
Sarojini Street, Stuartpet, Near Mani
Naidu Mahal, Arakkonam 631 001

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. Sai Sarvani

D/o. Suresh Kumar, Flat No. 25,
Guhaas Padmakshi Apartments
Thiruvalluvar Salai, Thiruvannamiyur,
Chennai 41

Respondent(s)

PRAYER: Civil Revision Petition filed under Article 227 of Constitution of India to strike off the Petition in DVC No.43 of 2025 filed by the respondent before the XVIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Saidapet, Chennai.

For Petitioner(s): Mr. T.Surendran

For Respondent(s): Ms.A.Rajeswari

ORDER



This civil revision petition is filed seeking to quash the complaint preferred by the respondent against the petitioner under the provisions of the Domestic Violence Act.

2. The petitioner is husband of the respondent. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the averments made in the complaint are false, baseless and unsubstantiated and the same has been filed only to grab money from the petitioner. He further submitted that the averments made in the complaint did not make any prima facie case against the petitioner and hence, the Magistrate ought not to have issued process to the petitioner.

3. 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 petitioner is aggrieved by the initiation of the proceedings under the Domestic Violence Act, it is for him to move the very same Magistrate raising preliminary issues. The relevant observation of Full Bench reads as follows:-



WEB COPY

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.



WEB COPY

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

5. Taking into consideration the proceedings initiated before learned Magistrate is predominantly civil in nature, the personal appearance of the petitioner during enquiry before Magistrate is dispensed with, unless his personal appearance is absolutely necessary.

03.12.2025

Internet: yes

Index: Yes/No

Neutral citation: Yes/No

MST

To

The XVIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Saidapet.



WEB COPY

CRP No.4152 of 2





WEB COPY

CRP No.4152 of 2



S.SOUNTHAR, J.

MST

CRP No.4152 of 2025

03.12.2025