



WEB COPY



Crl.R.C.No.2624 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 30.01.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

Crl.R.C.No.2624 of 2025

and

Crl.M.P.Nos.22982 & 22983 of 2025

Mr.P.Karthick

...Petitioner

-Vs-

State Represented by
The Sub-Inspector of Police,
S-2, Airport Police Station,
Chennai.

...Respondent

PRAYER: Criminal Revision Case filed under Sections 415 of the BNSS, praying to set aside the judgment passed by the learned Sessions Judge, Mahila Court, Chengalpattu, in C.A.No.86 of 2024 dated 17.11.2025 and the same confirming in C.C.No.878 of 2020 dated 29.08.2024 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Additional Mahila Court, Alandur.

For Petitioner : Mr.A.P.Sathya Murthy

For Respondent : Mr.R.Vinoth Raja,
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)



Crl.R.C.No.2624 of 2025

ORDER

WEB COPY

The petitioner has preferred the present Criminal Revision Case challenging the judgment dated 17.11.2025 passed in Crl.A.No.86 of 2024 by the learned Sessions Judge, Mahila Court, Chengalpattu, confirming the judgment of the learned Magistrate convicting the petitioner for the offence under Section 4 of the Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act, 2002 and sentencing him to undergo six months Rigorous Imprisonment and to pay a fine of Rs.15,000/-, in default to undergo two weeks Simple Imprisonment.

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 10.09.2019, the petitioner travelled in an international flight from Bahrain to India. During the flight, he consumed liquor beyond the permissible limit. Since such consumption was not permitted, the liquor bottle was confiscated by the crew members. Thereafter, the petitioner became aggressive and attempted to forcibly retrieve the liquor bottle. He started behaving in an unruly manner towards the crew members. Even when co-passengers attempted to pacify him, the petitioner continued to create disturbance, spat on the crew members, abused the women crew members in filthy language and made obscene remarks stating that they were fit only for “blow jobs”.



Crl.R.C.No.2624 of 2025

3. Based on the complaint given by PW1, who was working as a Coordinator in the Airline, a case was registered against the petitioner for the offence under Section 4 of the Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act, 2002. After investigation, PW13, the Sub-Inspector of Police, filed the final report against the petitioner for the said offence.

4. The prosecution examined 13 witnesses and marked 11 documents as Exs.P1 to P11. The Trial Court, on appreciation of the oral and documentary evidence, found the petitioner guilty of the offence under Section 4 of the Act and sentenced him to undergo six months Rigorous Imprisonment and to pay a fine of Rs.15,000/-. The Appellate Court confirmed the said conviction and sentence.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the impugned judgments are liable to be set aside as the evidence of the prosecution witnesses does not inspire confidence. It is further submitted that, in any event, the sentence imposed on the petitioner is excessive.

6. This Court has perused the judgments of the Courts below and the materials available on record. The prosecution has established its case



Crl.R.C.No.2624 of 2025

through the evidence of the crew members, co-passengers and the Doctor who examined the petitioner.

7. PW4, the Air Hostess, has clearly deposed that the petitioner became aggressive when the liquor bottle was confiscated, shouted and abused the women crew members in filthy language and spat on them. She has further stated that despite attempts made by co-passengers to pacify him, the petitioner continued his unruly behaviour.

8. PW5, the Captain of the flight has corroborated the fact that the petitioner created disturbance in the flight based on the information received from the crew.

9. PW6 and PW9, the co-passengers and eye-witnesses, have also corroborated the version of PW4 regarding the petitioner's abusive conduct towards the women crew members.

10. PW12, the Doctor who examined the petitioner, has stated that the petitioner smelt of alcohol. Though the petitioner refused to undergo blood and urine analysis, the medical evidence supports the prosecution case that he had consumed alcohol.



WEB COPY

11. The petitioner has not produced any material to discredit the prosecution evidence. The Courts below, upon proper appreciation of evidence, have rightly found the petitioner guilty of the offence under Section 4 of the Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act, 2002. This Court finds no infirmity in the concurrent findings.

12. However, considering that the occurrence took place in the year 2019, that the petitioner has no previous criminal antecedents, and that he is now married with two children, this Court is of the view that the sentence imposed on the petitioner can be modified as follows:

(i) The conviction of the petitioner for the offence under Section 4 of the Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act, 2002, by the learned Sessions Judge, Mahila Court, Chengalpattu, vide judgment dated 29.08.2024 in C.C.No.878 of 2020, is confirmed.

(ii) However, the sentence imposed on the petitioner i.e., Rigorous Imprisonment for six months and to pay a fine of Rs.15,000/-, in default to undergo Simple Imprisonment two weeks, is modified and the petitioner is sentenced to undergo Rigorous Imprisonment for one month and to pay a fine of Rs.15,000/-, in default to undergo simple imprisonment for two weeks.



Crl.R.C.No.2624 of 2025

SUNDER MOHAN, J.

(iii) The fine amount already paid, if any, shall be adjusted against the fine amount imposed now.

(iv) The period of sentence already undergone by the petitioner shall be set off under Section 428 of Cr.P.C.

13. With the above modification in sentence, this Criminal Revision Case stands disposed of. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

cda

30.01.2026

Index : Yes/No

Speaking Order/Non Speaking Order

To

1.The Judicial Magistrate, Additional Mahila Court, Alandur.

2.The Sessions Judge, Mahila Court, Chengalpattu,

3.The Sub-Inspector of Police,
S-2, Airport Police Station,
Chennai.

4.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

Crl.R.C.No.2624 of 2025

and

Crl.M.P.Nos.22982 & 22983 of 2025