



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 17-02-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE S. SOUNTHAR

**CRP No. 756 of 2026 and
CMP.No. 3975 and 3976 of 2026**

1. O Rajesh
2. O.Kanikaramma
3. O.Joseph

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

Mary Kumari

..Respondent(s)

Prayer:- Civil Revision Petition filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India praying to strike off the complaint in D.V.C. No. 48 of 2022 on the file of XVI Metropolitan Magistrate Court, George Town Chennai.

For Petitioner(s): R.Harinath

ORDER

The civil revision petition has been filed seeking to strike off the complaint preferred by the respondent under the provisions of Domestic Violence Act.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the 3rd petitioner died last week and therefore, the civil revision petition got abated as far as 3rd petitioner is concerned. The said statement is recorded.



3. The learned counsel further submitted that 2nd petitioner is living in a separate house and she never had shared household with the respondent and hence, the complaint under the provisions of Domestic Violence Act is not all maintainable. It is further stated that 1st petitioner is 80 % blind and there is no specific allegations of domestic violence against him in the complaint preferred by the respondent.

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 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 revision.

6. Accordingly, the Civil Revision petition stands dismissed with liberty to the petitioners 1 and 2 to approach the concerned Magistrate for getting appropriate remedy in terms of order passed in **Arul Daniel** case cited supra. The civil revision petition stands closed as abated as against the 3rd petitioner.

7. Having regard to the fact the complaint preferred under Section 12 of Domestic Violence Act is predominantly civil in nature, this Court is inclined to dispense with the personal appearance of the petitioners 1 and 2 before the



learned Magistrate unless it is absolutely necessary. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petitions are closed. No costs.

WEB COPY

17-02-2026

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

nr

To

The XVI Metropolitan Magistrate Court, George Town Chennai.



WEB COPY

CRP No. 756 of 2



S.SOUNTHAR, J.

NR

**CRP No. 756 of 2026 and
CMP.No. 3975 and 3976 of 2026**

17-02-2026