



WEB COPY



C.R.P.No.3584 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 27.11.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.SOUNTHAR

C.R.P.No.3584 of 2025
and C.M.P.Nos.19371 & 19367 of 2025

1. Mr.M.Shanmugam,
S/o.Late Mannathan

2. Mrs.P.Jothi,
W/o.Mr.Parthiban

... Petitioners

vs.

1. D.Vijaya @ Yamuna,
W/o.Late Devaraj

2. D.Vedha,
D/o.Late Devaraj

... Respondents

PRAYER: Civil Revision Petition is filed under Article 227 of Constitution of India, to reject the petition filed by the respondents in D.V.C.No.24 of 2025 before the learned Judicial Magistrate, Ambattur.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Parthasarathy

For Respondent : Mr.M.Manivelan [R1]

ORDER

This Civil Revision Petition is filed seeking to reject the complaint preferred by the respondents under the provisions of the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005 pending on the file of the Judicial Magistrate, Ambattur.



C.R.P.No.3584 of 2025

2. The learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners are the parents-in-law of the first respondent. According to the learned counsel for petitioners, the first respondent has preferred a complaint against the petitioners only to extract money. It is also stated that the averments made in the complaint are not sufficient to invoke the provisions of the Domestic Violence Act.

3. 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 Judicial Magistrate can go before the very same Judicial 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 Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005. 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.



WEB COPY



C.R.P.No.3584 of 2025

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.”

4. In view of the categorical pronouncement of law by the Full Bench of this Court that a person aggrieved by issuance of process can very well approach the concerned Judicial Magistrate seeking to strike off the DVC complaint, this Court is not inclined to exercise its supervisory power under Article 227 of the Constitution of India as held by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***Virudhunagar Nadargal Dharma Paripalana Shabha Vs Tuticorin Educational Society*** reported in ***MANU/SC/1365/2019***.

5. Accordingly, the Civil Revision Petition is dismissed with liberty



C.R.P.No.3584 of 2025

to the petitioner to approach the very same Judicial Magistrate seeking to strike off the DVC complaint. If any such application is filed and preliminary issue with regard to the maintainability of the petition against revision petitioner is raised, the Judicial Magistrate shall consider the same and dispose of the same as expeditiously as possible. Taking into consideration the allegations made in the complaint, the personal appearance of the petitioner is dispensed with before the learned Judicial Magistrate, Ambattur, unless their personal appearance is absolutely necessary. No costs. Consequently, the connected civil miscellaneous petitions are closed.

27.11.2025

Index : Yes / No
Speaking order : Yes / No
Neutral Citation : Yes / No
mp

To

1. The Judicial Magistrate, Ambattur.
2. V.R.Section,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



C.R.P.No.3584 of 2025
S.SOUNTHAR, J.

mp

C.R.P.No.3584 of 2025

27.11.2025