



WEB COPY

CRL RC No. 851 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 15-04-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

CRL RC No. 851 of 2026

R.Nalini

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

The Inspector of Police,
V-1, Villivakkam Police Station,
Vilivakkam, Chennai - 600 049.

..Respondent(s)

Prayer:- This Criminal Revision Case filed under Section 438 r/w 442 of BNSS, 2023, pleased to set aside the order in Crl.M.P.No.17372 of 2025 dated 24-02-2026 on the file of the XIII Metropolitan Magistrate and direct the respondent police to register the FIR on a complaint given by the petitioner dated 23.10.2025 and thus render justice.

For Petitioner(s):

Mr.P.Prakash Paul

For Respondent(s):

Mr.R.Kishore Kumar

Government Advocate (Criminal Side)

ORDER

This Criminal Revision Case is filed challenging the order passed by the learned XIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore, in Crl.M.P.No.17372 of 2025 dated 24.02.2026.

2.The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that under the pretext of entering into a lease agreement, accused received Rs.2,50,000/-. However, she has not returned the same. The fact that she neither executed a registered



deed nor returned the money demonstrates that she intended to deceive the petitioner from the very inception. However, the learned Magistrate failed to consider this aspect and erroneously dismissed the application.

3.The learned Government Advocate (Criminal side) appearing for the respondent submitted that the entire issue, even if it is unrebutted, only discloses a civil dispute. He contended that the ingredients required to bring the matter under criminal jurisdiction are absent and further submitted that there is no palpable error in the impugned order.

4.Heard the learned counsels on either side.

5.It is a settled principle of law that the scope of interference in matters involving revisional jurisdiction is very limited. Unless the order is perverse, passed without evidence, causes manifest injustice or contains a palpable error, the question of interfering with the order of the learned Magistrate does not arise. In the present case, although the learned counsel contended that there was an intention to deceive from the inception, the learned Magistrate rightly observed that the dispute pertains to the receipt of Rs.2,50,000/- for a lease agreement and is a civil dispute. If the petitioner has any grievance regarding the non-repayment of the said amount, the appropriate remedy is to approach a Civil Court. Therefore, this Court is of the firm view that there is no perversity



or palpable error in the reasoning provided by the learned Magistrate.

Accordingly, this Criminal Revision Case stands dismissed.

WEB COPY

15-04-2026

ep

To

1.XIII Metropolitan Magistrate,
Egmore.

2.The Inspector of Police,
V-1, Villivakkam Police Station,
Vilivakkam, Chennai - 600 049.

3.The Public Prosecutor
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY

CRL RC No. 851 of 2



C.KUMARAPPAN, J.

ep

CRL RC No. 851 of 2026

15-04-2026