



CrL.R.C.(MD)No.579 of 2025

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 09.06.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE L.VICTORIA GOWRI

CrL.R.C.(MD)No.579 of 2025

Sangili

... Petitioner

-VS-

State of Tamil Nadu,
The Inspector of Police,
Shencottai Police Station,
Puliyarai Police Station,
(in Crime No.11/2017)

... Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Review Case filed under 442 r/w. 438 of BNSS / 397 & 401 of Cr.P.C., to set aside the order dated 12.02.2025, passed in Cr.M.P.No.925 of 2024 in S.C.No.141 of 2018 on the file of the learned Additional District and Sessions Judge (FTC), Tenkasi.

For Petitioner : Mr.T.Bashyam
For Respondent : Mr.M.Sakthi Kumar,
Government Advocate (CrL.)

ORDER

This Criminal Revision Case have arisen, challenging the impugned order passed by the learned Additional District and Sessions Judge (FTC), Tenkasi in Cr.M.P.No.925 of 2024 in S.C.No.141 of 2018 dated 12.02.2025.



WEB COPY

2.The revision petitioner is the fourth accused in S.C.No.141 of 2018 and he had filed a petition before the learned Additional District and Sessions Judge, Tenkasi, seeking to summon the petition mentioned witnesses with the petition mentioned documents for defence side enquiry. However, the learned Trial Court had dismissed the petition.

3.The learned counsel appearing for the revision petitioner submitted that the witness sought for is a very important case to disprove the allegations set forth by the prosecution as against the 4th accused, that is, the petitioner herein and it is pertinent to dig out the facts relating to lease, which stood in the name of third person and not Hariharan.

4.Per contra, the learned Government Advocate (CrL.) appearing for the respondent submitted that, it is the admitted case of the prosecution that the fishing licence of the pond did not stand in the name of Hariharan and it is a common practice in villages to take lease in the name of another person. In this case, it stood in the name of Vadakasi and not in the name of Hariharan. It is the admitted case of the prosecution and it is only on the said ground, the impugned order came to be passed by the learned Trial Court. Hence, even if the witness as required by the petitioner is called for, it is not going to serve the case of the petitioner and hence, it is not necessary to interfere with the impugned order and pressed for



CrL.R.C.(MD)No.579 of 2025

dismissal of the Criminal Revision Case.

WEB COPY

5.Heard both sides and carefully perused the materials available on record.

6.A careful perusal of the impugned order and materials on record would clearly prove that it is the admitted case of prosecution that the lease stood certainly in the name of Vadakasi and not in the name of Hariharan and since the same is the admitted case of prosecution, it is not necessary to produce the fishing auction register as required by the petitioner herein.

7.Recording the same, this Criminal Revision Case is dismissed. No Costs.

09.06.2025

NCC :Yes/No
Index :Yes/No
Internet : Yes
Mrn

To

- 1.The Additional District and Sessions Judge (FTC), Tenkasi.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
Shencottai Police Station, Puliyarai Police Station.

Page 3 of 4



WEB COPY



CrL.R.C.(MD)No.579 of 2025

L.VICTORIA GOWRI, J.

Mrn

CrL.R.C.(MD)No.579 of 2025

09.06.2025