



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 29.10.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE T.V.THAMILSELVI

Crl.R.C.No.1600 of 2025

R. Vedagiri @ Wilson Vedagiri

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. State rep by
The Inspector of Police,
J-4 Kotturpuram Police Station,
Kotturpuram, Chennai – 600 085.

2. The Commissioner of Police,
Greater Chennai City,
Vepery, Chennai- 600 007.

... Respondent

PRAYER : This petition is filed under Section 397 and 401 of CrPc(438 r/w 442 of BNSS) to call for the records in respect of order dated 17.04.2025 passed in Crl.M.P.No.18042 of 2024 by the learned IX Metropolitan Magistrate, Saidapet, Chennai and set aside the same and pass orders.

For Petitioner : Mr.C.S. Dhanasekaran

For Respondent : Dr.C.E. Pratap, Government Advocate

ORDER

This Criminal Revision Case has been filed to call for the records in respect of order dated 17.04.2025 passed in Crl.M.P.No.18042 of 2024 by the learned IX Metropolitan Magistrate, Saidapet, Chennai and set aside the same and pass orders.



WEB COPY

2. The facts of the case is that the petitioner is the Managing Trustee of Carmel House of Prayer Trust. When this being the case, one Jayakumar being the treasurer was given in charge to handle the cash. It is alleged there was misappropriation of the trust funds to the tune of Rs.10,58,078/- by the said Jayakumar. Hence the petitioner has given a complaint and the same was taken on file in CrI.M.P.No.18042 of 2024 before the learned IX Metropolitan Magistrate, Saidapet, Chennai and the same was dismissed, which has given rise to this petition.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that it is the bounden duty of the treasurer to deposit the collected amounts in the Bank, which was not done. Failure on his part is not only maintainable and he should be liable to answer to the misappropriation of funds. Hence, prays to allow this petition.

4. The learned Government Advocate appearing for the respondent submits the complainant has not placed proper account statement to show the misappropriation. He further submitted that the petitioner is not a interested party to file the complaint. Hence prays to dismiss this petition.



5. Heard both sides and perused the material available on record.

6. On a perusal of the impugned order reveals that the learned Judge has held that the petitioner/complainant is not a aggrieved person and also did not placed proper statement to show that there was a misappropriation. As there is no *prima facie* material like statement of accounts to implicate the proposed accused, the order of dismissal passed by the Trial Court is perfectly valid in the eye of law and the same does not require interference by this Court.

7. For the foregoing reasons this Criminal Revision case stands dismissed.

29.10.2025

smn

Index:Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet:Yes

Neutral Citation:Yes/No

To

1.The Inspector of Police,
J-4 Kotturpuram Police Station,
Kotturpuram, Chennai – 600 085.

2. The learned IX Metropolitan Magistrate, Saidapet, Chennai



WEB COPY



T.V.THAMILSELVI, J.

smn

CrI.R.C.No.1600 of 2025

29.10.2025