



Crl.R.C.No.2732 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 12.12.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

Crl.R.C.No.2732 of 2025

and Crl.M.P.No.23932 of 2025

Kamalakannan

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. Thangamani
2. The State of Tamil Nadu
Represented by the Inspector of Police,
Jayankondam Police Station,
Ariyalur District.
3. Anjappan
4. Siva
5. Sindhuja
6. Sheela Rani
District Registrar,
Multi-Department Complex,
Jayankondam Road,
Ariyalur.
7. Manimegalai,
Sub Registrar,



Crl.R.C.No.2732 of 2025

WEB COPY

Pakutharivu Nagar,
Jayankondam,
Ariyalur District.
Mobile No.85268 29826

8. Rajavaduvelu
Advocate
T, Palur Road,
Opposite to Old Court Campus,
Jayankondam
Mobile No.98654 94515

9. Saravanan,
Former Tahsildar,
Takutharivu Nagar,
Jayankondam,
Ariyalur District
Mobile No.70941 89331

10. Packiaraj,
Village Administrative Officer,
Jayankondam Town,
Udaiyarpalayam Taluk,
Ariyalur District – 96989 31733

11. Sathishkumar

12. Gokulbabu
Advocate,
Opposite to DSP Office,
Jayankondam Road,
Ariyalur.

13. R.Silambarasan

14. Rajendran

... Respondents



Crl.R.C.No.2732 of 2025

Prayer: Criminal Revision Case filed under Section 438 r/w 442 of BNSS, 2023, to call for the records relating to the order dated 25.11.2025 in Crl.M.P.No.4610 of 2025 passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Jayankondam, set aside the same.

For Appellant : Mr.A.Suresh Sakthi Murugan
For R2 : Mr.C.E.Pratap
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

ORDER

The petitioner challenges the order dated 25.11.2025 passed by the learned Magistrate in Crl.M.P. No.4610 of 2025 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate No.I, Jayankondam, directing the respondent police to register an F.I.R against those persons if cognizable offence is made out or to file a report before the Magistrate Court within a reasonable time.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner, who is shown as a proposed accused, has challenged the said order on the ground that the learned Magistrate has violated the procedure in issuing such directions; that the petitioner is not involved in the offence; and therefore, the impugned order is liable to be set aside.



WEB COPY

3. Head the learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the 2nd respondent.

4. The relevant portion of the impugned order dated 25.11.2025 reads as follows:

“Consequently, the Station House Officer of Jayankondam Police Station is directed to conduct a preliminary inquiry upon this petition as per the directions set out by the Supreme Court in the Lalitha Kumari case. If, upon preliminary inquiry, the police shall register an FIR only against those against whom the cognizable offence is established, or otherwise file a report before this court within a reasonable time. This petition is allowed accordingly.”

5. The learned Magistrate had only directed the police to conduct an enquiry and register an F.I.R against the persons who have committed cognizable offence. Therefore, it is needless to say that the 2nd respondent



Crl.R.C.No.2732 of 2025

shall conduct an enquiry in terms of the order passed by the learned Magistrate and in case the petitioner is aggrieved by the registration of the F.I.R, he is at liberty to challenge the same by filing a quash petition.

6. With the above liberty, the Criminal Revision Case is disposed of. Connected, Criminal Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

12.12.2025

Index : Yes/No
Speaking Order/Non Speaking Order
Mac

SUNDER MOHAN, J.

Mac

To

1. The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Jayankondam



Crl.R.C.No.2732 of 2025

2. The Inspector of Police,
Jayankondam Police Station,
Ariyalur District.

3. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

Crl.R.C.No.2732 of 2025

and Crl.M.P.No.23932 of 2025

12.12.2025