



WEB COPY



Crl.R.C.No.2279 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 19.01.2026

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

Crl.R.C.No.2279 of 2025

Venkatesan

...Petitioner

-Vs-

1.Murali
2.Vasanthamurthy
3.Karthick

4.The State Represented by
The Sub-Inspector of Police,
(Law and Order)
R-8, Vadapalani Police Station,
Chennai – 600 026.

...Respondents

PRAYER: Criminal Revision Petition is filed under Sections 397 r/w 401 of Cr.P.C., to set aside the Judgment passed in Crl.A.No.461 of 2023 dated 04.09.2025 on the file of the XVIII Additional City Civil Court at Chennai in confirming the order of acquittal passed in C.C.No.2423 of 2019 dated 13.07.2023 on the file of the XVII Metropolitan Magistrate Court at Saidapet, Chennai – 15 against the Respondents 1 to 3 by allowing the present Criminal Revision Petition.

For Petitioner : R.Jayaprakash
For Respondents : Mr.M.Manimaran,
for RR1 to 3



Crl.R.C.No.2279 of 2025

WEB COPY

ORDER

The Revision challenges the Judgment passed in C.A.No.461 of 2023 by the learned XVIII Additional City Civil Court, Chennai, by which the Judgment passed by the Magistrate in C.C.No.2423/2019 acquitting the respondents 1 to 3 of the offences under Sections 448, 324, 323 and 506(ii) of IPC was confirmed.

2.The gist of the prosecution case is that on 27.05.2018 at about 21.00 hours, when the petitioner and his wife were in their house, the respondents 1 to 3 herein, due to previous enmity over a dispute relating to a common pathway, abused the petitioner in filthy language and pushed him on the iron gate, as a result of which, the petitioner sustained grievous injuries and thus the respondents 1 to 3 committed the offences.

3.The trial Court after considering the evidence acquitted the respondents 1 to 3 which was confirmed by the appellate court. The petitioner has filed this Revision challenging the aforesaid Judgment of the appellate Court.



WEB COPY

4.The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the evidence discloses the commission of offence by respondents 1 to 3; that the Courts below had not appreciated the evidence in the proper perspective; that the evidence of PW1 to PW3, who were injured witnesses, ought not to have been disbelieved; and that the Judgments of the Courts below are perverse and liable to be set aside.

5.The learned counsel for the respondents 1 to 3 *per contra* submitted that the trial Court has disbelieved the evidence of the witnesses, since there are vital contradictions; that the investigating officer, who had filed the final report against the respondents 1 to 3 as well as against the petitioner on the counter complaint, has violated PSO 588 A; and that the versions in the two final reports are contrary to each other. Therefore, he would submit that the Judgments of the trial Court and the Appellate Court do not call for any interference and prayed for dismissal.

6.It is seen from the Judgment of the trial Court that the trial Court had disbelieved the evidence of the witnesses as there are several inconsistencies



Crl.R.C.No.2279 of 2025

in their evidence as regards the manner in which the occurrence took place.

In fact, the trial Court has elaborately referred to the contradictions in the Judgment. The trial Court has also found that the investigating officer has filed two final reports by stating that the version of the petitioner as well as the version of the respondents 1 to 3 with regard to the alleged occurrence are true, which is opposed to PSO 588 A. The appellate Court confirmed the said findings.

7.On perusal of the records, it is seen that on the complaint given by first respondent, an FIR was registered against the petitioner and another, which culminated in CC.No.2924 of 2019. The investigating officer had filed the final reports in both the FIR's which contains contrary versions. It is needless to say that two contrary versions with regard to the same occurrence cannot be true. The investigating officer therefore violated PSO 588 A. That apart, there are several contradictions in the evidence of witnesses as rightly pointed out by the trial Court. Therefore, this Court finds no infirmity in the Judgment of acquittal passed by the trial Court and in the Judgment of the appellate Court confirming the said Judgment. Hence, the petitioner has not made out any grounds for interference in this Revision.



WEB COPY



Crl.R.C.No.2279 of 2025

8. Therefore, the Revision is dismissed.

19.01.2026

Tsg

To

1. The XVII Metropolitan Magistrate
Court at Saidapet, Chennai – 15.

2. The XVIII Additional City Civil Court
at Chennai.

3. The Sub-Inspector of Police,
(Law and Order)
R-8, Vadapalani Police Station,
Chennai – 600 026.

4. The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court.



WEB COPY



Crl.R.C.No.2279 of 2025

SUNDER MOHAN, J.

Tsg

Crl.R.C.No.2279 of 2025

19.01.2026