



Crl.R.C.No.1552 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 25.08.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE **G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN**

Crl.R.C.No.1552 of 2025

R.Prabhu

..... Petitioner

Vs

1.The Inspector of Police,
R-5, Virugambakkam Police Station,
Chennai-92

2.Sangeetha Vasudevan

3.Chitra Vasudevan

..... Respondents

PRAYER: Criminal Revision Case is filed under Section 442 of BNSS, praying to call for the records and to set aside the order in Crl.MP.No.7560 of 2025 dated 11.07.2025 on the file of the learned XXIII Metropolitan Magistrate Court, Saidapet, Chennai and to direct the first respondent police to register the case on complaint given by the petitioner on 01.04.2025.

For Petitioner : Mr.Arivazhagan
for Mr.V.Ravi

For Respondents
For R1 : Mr.A.Gopinath,
Government Advocate(crl.side)

ORDER

This Criminal Revision Case has been filed against the order passed in Crl.MP.No.7560 of 2025 dated 11.07.2025 on the file of the learned



Crl.R.C.No.1552 of 2025

XXIII Metropolitan Magistrate Court, Saidapet, Chennai.

WEB COPY

2. Heard, the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Government Advocate(crl.side) appearing for the first respondent and perused, all the materials placed before this Court.

3. On perusal of the records, it is revealed that the petitioner was the tenant under the third respondent. Since the entire building was in dilapidated condition, the third respondent obtained permission for demolishing the entire building. Accordingly, it was informed to the petitioner about the demolition of the building. Even then, the petitioner had kept his room under lock and key. Further, the petitioner sent notice to the third respondent. Thereafter, the petitioner lodged complaint alleging that some lights, which were kept in the room, were missing. On receipt of the said complaint, the petitioner was issued CSR. Thereafter, enquiry was conducted and during enquiry, it was found that there was tenant landlord dispute and no things were missing in the alleged premises. That apart, on perusal of the complaint, it is revealed that the petitioner had stated that some lights were missing. The petitioner also alleged that the third respondent threatened him with dire consequences and also used filthy languages. However, on perusal of the complaint lodged by the petitioner,



Crl.R.C.No.1552 of 2025

it is revealed that no such allegations were made. Hence, the trial court rightly

dismissed the petition and this Court finds no infirmity or illegality in the impugned order.

4. Accordingly, this criminal revision case stands dismissed.

25.08.2025

Index : Yes/No
Neutral citation : Yes/No
Speaking/non-speaking order
lok

To

- 1.The learned XXIII Metropolitan Magistrate Court, Saidapet, Chennai
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
R-5, Virugambakkam Police Station,
Chennai-92
- 3.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN, J.



WEB COPY



Crl.R.C.No.1552 of 2025

lok

Crl.R.C.No.1552 of 2025

25.08.2025