



WEB COPY



Crl.R.C.No.248 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 04.02.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

Crl.R.C.No.248 of 2026

L.Ramesh

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Commissioner of Police,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
EVK Sampath Road, Vepery,
Chennai – 600 007

2. The Inspector of Police,
CCB-2, Land Grabbing – 2,
Office of the Commissioner of Public,
EVK Sampath Road, Vepery,
Chennai – 600 007

3. The Inspector of Police,
Land Fraud Investigating Wing – II, Gama-6,
Central Crime Branch-III,
Vepery, Chennai – 600 007

... Respondents

Prayer: Criminal Revision Case filed under Section 438 r/w 442 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to set aside the order dated 07.10.2025 in Crl.M.P.No.3529 of 2025 passed by the Metropolitan Magistrate for Exclusive Trial of CCB Cases at Egmore.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Gnanam



Crl.R.C.No.248 of 2026

For R1 to R3 : Mr.R.Vinothraja
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

ORDER

The petitioner challenges the order of the learned Magistrate accepting the negative final report filed by the respondent herein on the complaint given by the petitioner.

2. It is the case of the petitioner that his signature was forged and a life certificate was obtained, and certain sale deeds were executed in favour of third parties and he lodged a complaint to the Police. Since the Police did not register the complaint, the petitioner approached the learned Magistrate, who passed an order directing the respondent to conduct an enquiry and file a report. As there was a delay in filing the report, the petitioner approached this Court in Crl.O.P.No.28950 of 2025 for a direction to the respondent to comply with the direction of the learned Magistrate. This Court after recording the fact that a report had been filed by the respondent had closed the Criminal Original Petition with liberty to challenge the final report in the manner known to law.



Crl.R.C.No.248 of 2026

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the report of the respondent filed without registering an F.I.R cannot be sustained and consequently, the order accepting the report has to be set aside.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) for the respondents, per contra, would submit that on the very same allegations, the mother of the petitioner had lodged a complaint, which was registered in Crime No.138 of 2022 on the file of the CCB/2nd respondent herein and the same was closed as “further action dropped”. Since the allegations were found to be false, the respondent filed the report, which cannot be faulted.

5. Admittedly, the same complaint given by the petitioner’s mother was closed after registering the F.I.R in Crime No.138 of 2022. The respondent's report states that the allegation that the petitioner’s signature was forged in the life certificate is not correct. Therefore, this Court finds no infirmity in the impugned order. In view of the same, it is open to the petitioner to work out his remedy in the manner known to law.



Crl.R.C.No.248 of 2026

6. With the above observations, this Criminal Revision Case is
dismissed.

04.02.2026

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

To

1. The Metropolitan Magistrate for Exclusive Trial of CCB Cases at Egmore.
2. 1. The Commissioner of Police,
Office of the Commissioner of Police,
EVK Sampath Road, Vepery,

Page No.4 of 6



Crl.R.C.No.248 of 2026

Chennai – 600 007

3. The Inspector of Police,
CCB-2, Land Grabbing – 2,
Office of the Commissioner of Public,
EVK Sampath Road, Vepery,
Chennai – 600 007
4. The Inspector of Police,
Land Fraud Investigating Wing – II, Gama-6,
Central Crime Branch-III,
Vepery, Chennai – 600 007
5. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

SUNDER MOHAN, J.

Mac



WEB COPY



Crl.R.C.No.248 of 2026

Crl.R.C.No.248 of 2026

04.02.2026