



Crl. R.C. No. 2213 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 27.11.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE Mrs. JUSTICE T.V.THAMILSELVI

Crl. R.C. No. 2213 of 2025

Manimaaran

.. Petitioner

Vs

1.The Inspector of Police,
Mamallapuram Police Station,
Chengalpattu District.

2.Mohan

3.Aliyappan

4.Kesavan

5.Manivasakam

6.Ramamoorthy

.. Respondents

Civil Revision Petition is filed under Section 438 r/w 442 of Bharathya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to set aside the order dated 02.08.2025 passed in CMP No.117 of 2025 by the learned District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate, Thirkalukundram, Chengalpattu District.

For Petitioner : Mr. M. Vijaya Ragavan

For Respondents : Dr. C.E. Pratap,

Government Advocate (Crl.Side) for R1

Mr. K. Selva Kumar, for R2 to R6



ORDER

WEB COPY

Challenging the final report submitted by the respondent police, the defacto complainant preferred this revision.

2. Before the trial Court, he filed a private complaint under Section 175(3) of BNSS against the proposed accused, stating that on 17.12.2024 an incident occurred, in which nearly 21 families were suffered and caused damages to the articles and took away gold jewellery. Based on the complaint, a CSR was issued, but no further action was taken by the police. Consequently, the private complaint was taken on file and the respondent police were directed to submit a report after conducting a proper investigation. On the same set of allegations, an FIR had already been registered, as per the complaint given by one Abirami. Since the FIR was already registered in respect of the same occurrence and allegations, the CMP was closed. Aggrieved by the same, the present revision has been filed.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that although the date of occurrence is the same, the complaint given by the petitioner is



entirely different and not identical to the complaint lodged by one Abirami.

He further contended that more than Rs.3,00,000/- articles were damaged, giving rise to a completely distinct cause of action, but the police have erroneously treated both complaints as one and the same in the final report. Therefore, it requires interference.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the proposed accused submitted that the petitioner has repeatedly been filing vexatious complaints, despite having misappropriated village funds to the tune of several crores while holding the position of Vice President of the Village Panchayat. He further alleged that the petitioner, along with his relatives, misappropriated an additional sum of approximately Rs.2 crores from the funds of the Village Panchayat. It is further contended that the petitioner is attempting to harass the proposed accused by advancing baseless and vexatious claims and that the trial Court had rightly concluded and dismissed the same.

5. The learned Government Advocate submitted that if any further information or material is collected by the investigating officer, the same will be placed before this Court in due course. He further stated that this



aspect had already been duly considered and rightly appreciated by the trial Court.

6. On considering both submissions and on perusal of the records, it is evident that an occurrence took place on 17.12.2024, pursuant to which a complaint was lodged by one Abirami, leading to the registration of Crime No. 520 of 2024 for the offences under Sections 126(2), 191(2), 191(3), 296(b), 115(2), 118(1), 324(5) and 351(3) of BNS, 2023. In the said complaint, it was specifically alleged that the acts of the proposed accused resulted in unlawful interference and caused loss and damage impacting nearly 21 families.

7. The petitioner has again approached the Court with the present complaint concerning the very same date of occurrence, by introducing an additional event and alleging that further materials and properties were damaged during the same incident. However, the petitioner has failed to enclose any supporting material or documentary proof. The records further reflect absence of any credible material demonstrating the veracity of the claims now advanced.



Crl. R.C. No. 2213 of 2025

WEB COPY

8. In view of the above, this Court finds that the order passed by the learned trial Judge warrants no interference.

9. Accordingly, the Criminal Revision Case stands dismissed and the findings of the trial Court are hereby confirmed.

27.11.2025

Index :Yes/No
Neutral Citation :Yes/No
AT

To

- 1.The District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate,
Thirkalukundram, Chengalpattu District.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
Mamallapuram Police Station,
Chengalpattu District.
- 3.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



Crl. R.C. No. 2213 of 2025

T.V.THAMILSELVI, J.

AT

Crl. R.C. No. 2213 of 2025

27.11.2025