



Crl.R.C(MD)No.1266 of 2025

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: **17.09.2025**

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE **MR.JUSTICE SHAMIM AHMED**

CRL.R.C.(MD)No.1266 of 2025

R.Sathish,
S/o.Rajasekar,
No.5/225 D, EB Colony, Salai Pudur,
Aalampatti Post,
Thoothukudi District.

... Petitioner

vs.

1.The Inspector of Police,
Kovilpatti West Police Station,
Kovilpatti,
Thoothukudi District.

2.Rengapriya
D/o.Rajamohan,
6B/33, K.C.Nayanar Street,
Samathanapuram,
Palaiyankottai,
Tirunelveli District.

... Respondents

(The name of the 2nd Respondent is corrected vide order dated 17.09.2025 in Crl.R.C.(MD)No.1266 of 2025)



Crl.R.C(MD)No.1266 of 2025

PRAYER: Criminal Revision Petition is filed under Section 438 r/w 442 of BNSS, 2023, to call for the records and to set aside the order passed in Crl.MP.No.535 of 2025 dated 03.04.2025 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Kovilpatti.

For Petitioner :Mr.V.Vishnu

For Respondent :Mr.M.Karunanithi
Government Advocate
(Criminal Side) For R-1

ORDER

Heard Mr.V.Vishnu, learned counsel appearing for the Petitioner and Mr.M.Karunanithi, learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side), for the 1st Respondent. Since the Criminal Revision Petition is disposed of at the admission stage itself and in view of the order to be passed in this petition, notice to the 2nd Respondent is dispensed with.

2. This Criminal Revision Petition has been filed by the petitioner to set aside the order passed in Crl.MP.No.535 of 2025 dated 03.04.2025 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Kovilpatti.



Crl.R.C(MD)No.1266 of 2025

3. Mr.V.Vishnu, learned counsel appearing for the Petitioner, submits that the name of the 2nd Respondent is incorrectly mentioned in the petition as Rengaraja S/o. Rajamohan instead of Rengapriya D/o. Rajamohan. He therefore prays this Court to permit him to make the correction of the same in the petition.

4. This Court, upon perusing the entire records, permits the learned counsel for the Petitioner to correct the name of the 2nd Respondent as "Rengapriya D/o. Rajamohan" in the present petition.

5.The facts of the case in a nutshell, led to filing of this Criminal Revision Petition and necessary for disposal of the same, are as follows:-

a) The Petitioner has been working in Bangalore since 2016. In 2015, the 2nd Respondent/accused, Rengapriya, became acquainted with the Petitioner. Allegedly, taking advantage of their friendship since 2019, she fraudulently obtained Rs.45,00,000/- from the Petitioner by threatening to report him for cheating her by falling in love and having intimacy with her.



Cr.L.R.C(MD)No.1266 of 2025

WEB COPY

b) Feeling aggrieved, the Petitioner filed a complaint on 01.03.2025, at the Kovilpatti All Women Police Station, alleging that the 2nd Respondent had illegally and fraudulently obtained the said amount through blackmail. The complaint was registered as CSR No. 358/2025. Despite the same, no action was taken.

c) Thereafter, the Petitioner sent the complaint to the Kovilpatti Deputy Superintendent of Police and the Thoothukudi District Superintendent of Police on 13.03.2025, requesting action against the accused, but no action was taken.

d) Subsequently, the Petitioner filed a Criminal Miscellaneous Petition in Cr.M.P.No.535 of 2025 before the Judicial Magistrate Court No. II, Kovilpatti, seeking to have the complaint taken on file and to order a First Information Report (FIR) to be registered against the accused. The Trial Court dismissed the petition on 03.04.2025, stating that there were no specific allegations or averments against the accused and that the petition lacked merits. Aggrieved by the order of the Judicial Magistrate Court No.II, Kovilpatti, the Petitioner filed the



Crl.R.C(MD)No.1266 of 2025

present Criminal Revision Petition seeking to set aside the order passed in Crl.MP.No.535 of 2025 dated 03.04.2025 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Kovilpatti.

6. The learned counsel for the Petitioner submits that the Petitioner is a poor man undergoing financial distress and has been victimized by the accused's fraudulent actions. The Trial Court erred in dismissing the petition without properly considering the allegations and evidence. The Petitioner has made out a prima facie case against the accused, and the FIR should be registered. The order passed by the Trial Court is liable to be set aside, and the present Criminal Revision Petition should be allowed.

7. Mr.M.Karunanithi, learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) for the 1st Respondent submits that the Trial Court has passed the impugned order after duly considering the facts and circumstances of the case. It is contended that, in such circumstances, and in order to meet the ends of justice, the impugned order does not warrant any interference by



CrI.R.C(MD)No.1266 of 2025

WEB COM

this Court. There is no illegality, impropriety, or perversity in the impugned order, nor does it reflect any abuse of the process of the Court.

He further submits that the Petitioner's case appears to be an attempt to defame the woman and prays this Court to dismiss the petition with exemplary costs, so that in future, nobody tries to take advantage by filing this type of petition.

8. Having considered the submissions of the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record, including the order passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Kovilpatti.in CrI.MP.No.535 of 2025 dated 03.04.2025, this Court observes that entertaining petitions of this nature would likely cause irreparable harm to the reputation of the woman. The averments made in the petition appear to be a calculated attempt to defame the woman. This Court is not convinced by the contentions raised by the learned counsel for the Petitioner. The petition, lacks merit and seems to be filed with ulterior motives. Thus, this Court is inclined to dismiss the petition to prevent misuse of the legal process and protect the dignity and reputation of those unfairly targeted.



WEB COPY 9. Further, this Court observes that the societal context and cultural norms prevalent in our country must be given due consideration. Unlike some Western countries where certain types of relationships may be more prevalent and socially accepted, our nation places significant importance on its rich cultural heritage and traditional values, which are integral to its identity. These values and traditions are a source of pride for our country and its people.

10. In the present case, this Court finds that the Petitioner's allegations appear to be an attempt to harm the reputation of the 2nd Respondent/Rengapriya, which could potentially make it difficult for her family to arrange her marriage with a suitable family of their choice in the future. Thus, allowing such actions without proper basis could harm our cultural and traditional values. Therefore, the Court must be cautious and not entertain frivolous petitions aimed at defaming individuals. The Petitioner's actions appear to be intended to tarnish the 2nd Respondent's



Crl.R.C(MD)No.1266 of 2025

WEB COPY

reputation without sufficient evidence. Such attempts to defame a woman without credible material are unwarranted and harmful to society.

11. Thus, this Court does not find any merit in the Petitioner's case and the learned Trial Court had rightly dismissed the case of the Petitioner by way of the reasoned and speaking order, dated 03.04.2025. In view of the above, this Criminal Revision Case is liable to be dismissed.

12. Accordingly, with the above observations, this Criminal Revision Petition is **dismissed** and the file is consigned to record. There shall be no order as to costs.

Index :Yes / No
Internet :Yes / No
NCC :Yes / No
Nsr

17.09.2025

To:

1. The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Kovilpatti.
- 2.The Additional Public Prosecutor, Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai



WEB COPY



Crl.R.C(MD)No.1266 of 2025

SHAMIM AHMED, J.

Nsr

Order made in
Crl.R.C(MD)No.1266 of 2025

17.09.2025