



Crl.R.C.No.2719 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.2719 of 2025

Vedammal

... Petitioner

Vs.

State Rep. By
The Inspector of Police,
T-4 Madhuravoyal Police Station,
Madhuravoyal, Chennai.

...Respondent

PRAYER: Criminal Revision Case filed under Sections 438 r/w 442 of the BNSS, praying to call for the records relating to the order passed in Crl.M.P.No.1422 of 2025 dated 14.10.2025 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Poonamallee, Chennai, and set aside the same and pass such further orders.

For Petitioner : Mr.G.Vinodhkumar

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



Crl.R.C.No.2719 of 2025

ORDER

The revision petition has been filed challenging the dismissal of the petitioner's application filed under Section 175(3) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, seeking registration of FIR on his complaint.

2. The gist of the allegations in the complaint of the petitioner is that the petitioner is the landlord; that the proposed accused are tenants; that the proposed accused have been causing nuisance to the petitioner as well as to the neighbours by permitting several stray dogs and cats inside the house without consent, resulting in health hazards; and that when the petitioner demanded that the proposed accused vacate the premises, the proposed accused abused the petitioner in filthy language and also threatened her with dire consequences.

3. The learned Magistrate found that the dispute is between the landlord and the tenants; that the tenants have filed a suit in O.S.No.206 of 2025 before the District Munsif Court, Poonamallee, praying for an injunction not to be dispossessed from the premises except by due process of law; and that since the petitioner is aggrieved with the conduct of the proposed accused, the instant application has been filed, and that no cognizable offence has been made out.



Crl.R.C.No.2719 of 2025

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is a senior citizen; that the fact that the proposed accused had abused the petitioner and threatened her with dire consequences cannot be disputed; that in any case, the learned Magistrate ought not to have held that the allegations are false at this stage; and that therefore the impugned order is liable to be set aside.

5. Admittedly, the petitioner is the landlord and the proposed accused are the tenants. The proposed accused have also filed a suit in O.S.No.206 of 2025 as stated above before the District Munsif Court, Poonamallee, which is pending adjudication. It appears that, pursuant to the directions issued by the learned Magistrate, the police have filed a report stating that the allegations with regard to criminal intimidation and abuse were not made in the earlier complaint and that the petitioner had only sought eviction of the respondents in the earlier complaint.

6. Considering these facts, this Court finds that there is no infirmity in the order passed by the learned Magistrate and hence the same does not call for any interference.



Crl.R.C.No.2719 of 2025

SUNDER MOHAN, J.

WEB COPY

7. Accordingly, this criminal revision petition stands dismissed.

cda

11.12.2025

Index : Yes/No

Speaking Order/Non Speaking Order

To

1.The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Poonamallee,
Chennai.

2.The Inspector of Police,
T-4 Madhuravoyal Police Station,
Madhuravoyal, Chennai.

3.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

Crl.R.C.No.2719 of 2025