



WEB COPY



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 17-12-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

CRL RC No. 2254 of 2025

V.Murugesan

Petitioner(s)

Vs

State Rep. by
Inspector of Police
Kaaripatti Police Station,
Salem District.

Respondent(s)

PRAYER: Criminal Revision filed under Section 430 BNSS to set aside the order dated 07.04.2025 made in C.M.P.No.66 of 2025 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.6, Salem and allow this Criminal Revision Petition.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.B.Mohan

For Respondent(s): Dr.C.E.Pratap
Government Advocate (Crl. side)

ORDER

This petition has been filed challenging the impugned order passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate No.6, Salem, by which, the learned Judicial Magistrate had directed the respondent herein to conduct enquiry and complete the same within a period of four (4) weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of that order with a further direction that in case the complaint is closed, a closure report should be furnished to the petitioner within a week of such closure.



2.The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the learned Judicial Magistrate erred in issuing such a direction as the complaint discloses cognizable offence of criminal intimidation and the offence of abusing the petitioner and that therefore, the impugned order is liable to be set aside. The learned counsel further submitted that pursuant to the impugned order, the respondent conducted an enquiry and filed the closure report on 06.05.2025 and the respondent's action without registration of an FIR cannot be justified.

3.The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) per contra submitted that the allegation in the complaint only reveals a civil dispute; that the respondent, after conducting due enquiry, found that the complaint of the petitioner does not warrant registration of an FIR and there is no infirmity in either the order passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate or in the closure report filed by the respondent and sought dismissal of the petition.

4.As stated above, the petitioner has only challenged the order passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate directing enquiry and the petitioner has not challenged the closure report. There is no infirmity in the order passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate directing enquiry in a case of this nature. The gist of the allegation is that the respondent is preventing the petitioner from conducting survey and abusing and threatening the petitioner with dire consequences. The complaint, *prima facie*, does not disclose any threat and predominantly



discloses a civil dispute. Therefore, this Court does not find any infirmity in the impugned order directing enquiry and as stated above, the respondent, after conducting enquiry, have filed the closure report. Hence, this criminal revision petition stands dismissed.

17-12-2025

Index:Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet:Yes

Neutral Citation:Yes/No

sli

To

1. The Judicial Magistrate No.6,
Salem.

2.The Inspector of Police
Kaaripatti Police Station,
Salem District.

3.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY

4/4

CRL RC No. 2254 of 2



SUNDER MOHAN, J.

sli

CRL RC No. 2254 of 2025

17-12-2025