



CRP.No.6328 and 6334 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 11.12.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.SOUNTHAR

CRP.No.6328 and 6334 of 2025 and
CMP.No.31410, 31418, 31421 and 31423 of 2025

In CRP.No.6328 of 2025

1. B.Menaka
2. Jeeva Karunya ... Petitioners

Vs.

N.Ashwini ...Respondent

PRAYER :Civil Revision Petition filed Article 227 of Constitution of India, praying to call for the records in DVC.No.107/2025 pending on the file of the Honble XVIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Saidapet and to strike off the proceeding in DVC.No. 107/2025 on the file of the Honble XVIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Saidapet.

For Petitioners : M/s.A.Shabnam Banu

In CRP.No.6334 of 2025

B.Sathishkumar ... Petitioner

Vs.

N.Ashwini ...Respondent



PRAYER : Civil Revision Petition filed Article 227 of Constitution of India, praying to call for the records in DVC.No.107/2025 pending on the file of the Honble XVIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Saidapet and to strike off the proceeding in DVC.No. 107/2025 on the file of the Honble XVIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Saidapet.

For Petitioner : M/s.A.Shabnam Banu

COMMON ORDER

These civil revision petitions are filed seeking to quash the complaint preferred by the respondent/complainant under the provisions of Domestic Violence Act.

2. The petitioners are husband, mother-in-law and sister-in-law of the respondent/complainant.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that in the complaint preferred by the respondent, there is no plea that building mentioned in prayer “A” constitutes shared household and therefore, the complaint is not maintainable. It is further stated that in the light of the prayer made in the complaint, the learned XVIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Saidapet has no jurisdiction to entertain the complaint. The points raised by the petitioners are with regard to the absence of shared household and the jurisdiction, which are



preliminary issues. Therefore, the same can be raised before the very same Magistrate.

WEB COPY

4. The Full Bench of this Court in the case of ***Arul Daniel and Others Versus Suganya reported in (2022) SCC Online Mad 5435*** held that any person aggrieved by the process issued by the Magistrate can go before the very same Magistrate and raise preliminary objections with regard to the issues like non-existence of a shared household/ domestic relationship etc., If any order is passed, the aggrieved person can also take recourse to an appeal under Section 29 of the Domestic Violence Act. The relevant portion reads as follows:-

87(vii). *As there is no issuance of process as contemplated under Section 204, Cr.P.C. in a proceeding under the D.V. Act, the principle laid down in Adalat Prasad v. Rooplal Jindal ((2004) 7 SCC 338) that a process, under Section 204, Cr.P.C, once issued cannot be reviewed or recalled, will not apply to a proceeding under the D.V. Act. Consequently, it would be open to an aggrieved respondent (s) to approach the Magistrate and raise the issue of maintainability and other preliminary issues. Issues like the existence of a shared household/domestic relationship etc., which form the jurisdictional basis for entertaining an application under Section 12, can be determined as a*



preliminary issue, in appropriate cases. Any person aggrieved by such an order may also take recourse to an appeal under Section 29 of the D.V. Act for effective redress (See V.K. Vijayalekshmi Amma v. Bindu V., (2010) 87 AIC 367). This would stem the deluge of petitions challenging the maintainability of an application under Section 12 of the D.V. Act, at the threshold before this Court under Article 227 of the Constitution.

5. In view of the availability of alternative remedy before Magistrate, as held by Full Bench in **Arul Daniel** case, this Court is not inclined to exercise supervisory power under Article 227 of the Constitution of India. Further, the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Virudhunagar Nadargal Dharma Paripalana Shabha Vs Tuticorin Educational Society** reported in **MANU/SC/1365/2019** held that availability of alternative remedy before regular Courts, is near total bar for exercise of supervisory power by High Court. Hence, I am not inclined to interfere in revisions.

6. Accordingly, these Civil Revision Petitions are dismissed with liberty to the petitioners to approach the concerned Magistrate for getting appropriate remedy in terms of order passed in **Arul Daniel** case cited supra.



CRP.No.6328 and 6334 of 2025

7. Having regard to the fact the complaint preferred under Section 12 of Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005 is predominantly civil in nature, this Court is inclined to dispense with the personal appearance of the petitioners before the learned Magistrate unless it is absolutely necessary. Accordingly, the CMP.Nos.31410 & 31423 of 2025 is ordered. The CMP.Nos.31418 & 31421 of 2025 is closed. No costs.

11.12.2025

Index : Yes / No

Internet : Yes / No

nr

To

The XVIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Saidapet



WEB COPY



CRP.No.6328 and 6334 of 2025

S.SOUNTHAR, J.

nr

**CRP.No.6328 and 6334 of 2025 and
CMP.No.31410, 31418, 31421 and 31423 of 2025**

11.12.2025