



Crl.R.C.No.2737 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 15.12.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

Crl.R.C.No.2737 of 2025

N.Vijaya

...Petitioner

-Vs-

1.The Commissioner of Police,
Avadi Police Station,
Office of the C.O.P., Avadi,
Chennai – 600 054.

2.The Inspector of Police, L & O
T-14 Mangadu Police Station,
Mangadu, Chennai – 600 122.

3.The Inspector of Police,
T-14 Mangadu Police Station,
Mangadu, Chennai – 600 122.

...Respondents

PRAYER: Criminal Revision Petition is filed under Sections 438 r/w 422 of BNSS, 2023, praying to call for the records and set aside the order dated 13.08.2025 passed in Crl.M.P.No.5243 of 2024 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Sriperumbudur, and thus direct the respondent No.3 to register a first information report on the basis of the report dated 03.04.2024 lodged by the petitioner herein with the respondent No.1 and 2, though speed proof of delivery and consequently conduct an investigation as envisaged under law and file a final report in connection the same.



Crl.R.C.No.2737 of 2025

For Petitioner : Mr.K.Sathish
For Respondents : Dr.C.E.Pratap,
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

ORDER

The petition challenges the dismissal of the petitioner's application filed under Section 175(3) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

2. The gist of the allegation is that the petitioner is the owner of the disputed property; that her mother and brother, in collusion with certain third parties, had sold the property belonging to her contrary to the orders passed by the Civil Court; that the purchasers were attempting to trespass into the property of the petitioner; and that when the petitioner questioned the same, they threatened her of dire consequences.

3. Since the petitioner's complaint was not registered by the police, the petitioner approached the learned Judicial Magistrate under Section 175(3) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, seeking a direction to register the complaints. The learned Magistrate dismissed the said petition on the ground that the petitioner had only disclosed a civil dispute between herself and the proposed accused and that no cognizable offence was made out.



Crl.R.C.No.2737 of 2025

WEB COPY

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner, however, would submit that the proposed accused had threatened the petitioner of dire consequences; that the petitioner was armed with an order of the Civil Court granting injunction restraining interference with her possession; that in spite of the same, the proposed accused were interfering with the petitioner's possession; that therefore, a cognizable offence had been made out; and that the learned Magistrate, erroneously dismissed the petitioner's application.

5. Heard the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) for the respondent.

6. The complaint of the petitioner runs to ten pages. In the complaint, the details of the civil dispute have been elaborately set out. It appears that the petitioner had filed a suit in O.S.No.268 of 2013. The learned District Munsif, Sriperumbudur, had granted an order of ad-interim injunction restraining the proposed accused from interfering with the petitioner's peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit property. Admittedly, the petitioner continues to be in possession of the property. If there is any attempt to interfere in his possession by any person, it is needless to say that



Crl.R.C.No.2737 of 2025

it is always open to the petitioner to seek appropriate remedy before the Civil Court.

7. The other allegation with regard to the offence of criminal intimidation punishable under Sections 351 and 352 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, it is alleged that the respondents had threatened the petitioner of dire consequences. It is well settled that, in order to attract the offence of criminal intimidation, mere vague allegations or bald statements are not sufficient and there must be real threat. There is no such allegation. The complaint only discloses a dispute of civil nature. A civil suit is already pending between the parties. Therefore, the Trial Court has rightly dismissed the petition; and this Court is not inclined to interfere with the said order.

8. Accordingly, this criminal revision case stands dismissed.

15.12.2025

cda



WEB COPY



Crl.R.C.No.2737 of 2025

To

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate, Sriperumbudur.
- 2.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



Crl.R.C.No.2737 of 2025

SUNDER MOHAN, J.

cda

Crl.R.C.No.2737 of 2025

15.12.2025