



WEB COPY



Crl.R.C.No.2717 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 11.12.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

Crl.R.C.No.2717 of 2025

M.Arokianathan

... Petitioner

Vs.

State Rep. By
The Inspector of Police (L&O),
H-3, Tondiarpet Police Station,
Chennai – 600 081.

...Respondent

PRAYER: Criminal Revision Case filed under Sections 438 and 442 of the BNSS, praying to call for the records of the learned XV Metropolitan Magistrate, George Town, Chennai, and set aside the order passed by the learned XV Metropolitan Magistrate, George Town, Chennai, made in Crl.M.P.No.1487 of 2025 dated 23.09.2025 and further directing the respondent to register the First Information Report in view of the petitioner's complaint dated 20.12.2024 on the file of the respondent police and pass such further orders.

For Petitioner : Mr.J.E.R.Lenin

For Respondent : Dr.C.E.Pratap,
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)



WEB COPY



Crl.R.C.No.2717 of 2025

ORDER

The revision petition challenges the order passed by the learned Magistrate in Crl.M.P.No.1487 of 2025 dated 23.09.2025; dismissing the petitioner's application filed under Section 175(3) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita.

2. The gist of the allegation is that the proposed accused is the wife of the petitioner; that the petitioner had suspected the character of his wife and had therefore followed her and taken photographs; that when the wife questioned the same, the petitioner was attacked and threatened; and that thereby the proposed accused had committed the offence of criminal intimidation and other offences.

3. The petitioner had approached the police, and though a CSR was initially registered, the same was closed and a closure report was filed on 20.12.2024. Hence, the petitioner approached the learned Magistrate seeking a direction to register an FIR.



Crl.R.C.No.2717 of 2025

WEB COPY

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the allegations disclosed the commission of cognizable offences and that the learned Magistrate ought not to have conducted a roving enquiry and held that the allegations of the petitioner are false at this stage; and that therefore the impugned order passed by the learned Magistrate is liable to be set aside.

5. This Court finds that the learned Magistrate has taken into consideration that the proposed accused, namely the wife of the petitioner, had lodged an earlier complaint against the petitioner stating that he had been following her illegally and causing harassment to her. It is also seen that she has filed a complaint under the provisions of the Domestic Violence Act against the petitioner.

6. The learned Magistrate, therefore, found that the petitioner was the aggressor and that the police had rightly not registered any case on the complaint given by the petitioner. It is also seen that the complaint of the petitioner dated 20.12.2024 is very vague in nature.



WEB COPY



Crl.R.C.No.2717 of 2025

SUNDER MOHAN, J.

7. Considering all these aspects, this Court finds no infirmity in the order passed by the learned Magistrate. Accordingly, this criminal revision stands dismissed as devoid of merits. However, it is open to the petitioner to work out his remedy, if available, in the manner known to law.

cda

11.12.2025

Index : Yes/No

Speaking Order/Non Speaking Order

To

The XV Metropolitan Magistrate,
George Town, Chennai.

Crl.R.C.No.2717 of 2025