



C.R.P.No.659 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 13.02.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.SOUNTHAR

C.R.P.No.659 of 2026
and
C.M.P.No.3561 of 2026

1.Parvatham

2.Gokulavani

3.Chitradevi

4.Manian

5.Sudha

6.Malathi

7.Thirumoorthi

... Petitioners

vs.

Priya

... Respondent

PRAYER: Civil Revision Petition is filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, to strike off the complaint in D.V.C.No.13 of 2025 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Kangayam by allowing this Civil Revision Petition.

For Petitioners : Mr.N.Manoharan



C.R.P.No.659 of 2026

ORDER

WEB COPY

The Civil Revision Petition is filed seeking to strike off the complaint preferred by the respondent under the provisions of Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005 in D.V.C.No.13 of 2025 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate, Kangayam.

2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners are in laws of the respondent and complaint has been preferred after death of her husband. It is also stated that the respondent already filed a suit in O.S.No.258 of 2025 on the file of the Additional District Court and Sessions Court, Dharapuram seeking partition against the petitioners and the same is pending. The respondent cleverly drafted the complaint by narrating different stories to file suit and implicate all the family members of the deceased husband and hence, the learned Magistrate ought not have issued process to the petitioners.

3. 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 Judicial Magistrate can go before the very same Judicial 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 Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005. 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



C.R.P.No.659 of 2026

Constitution.”

WEB COPY

4. In view of the categorical pronouncement of law by the Full Bench of this Court that a person aggrieved by issuance of process can very well approach the concerned Judicial Magistrate raising preliminary issues and hence, this Court is not inclined to exercise its supervisory power under Article 227 of the Constitution of India. When petitioners have remedy before Regular Magistrate, as held by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***Virudhunagar Hindu Nadargal Dharma Paribalana Sabai and others vs. Tuticorin Educational Society and others*** reported in ***MANU/SC/1365/2019***, this Court need not exercise its supervisory jurisdiction.

5. Accordingly, the Civil Revision Petition is dismissed with liberty to the petitioners to approach the very same Judicial Magistrate, Kangayam raising preliminary issues. If any such application is filed and preliminary issue with regard to the maintainability of the petition against revision petitioners is raised, the Judicial Magistrate, Kangayam, shall consider and dispose of the same as expeditiously as possible.



C.R.P.No.659 of 2026

WEB COPY

6. The complaint preferred by the respondent seeking various orders under Sections 12, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22 and 23 of the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005, are predominantly civil in nature and therefore, this Court is inclined to dispense with the personal appearance of the petitioners before the Judicial Magistrate, Kangayam, unless their presence is absolutely necessary. No costs. Consequently, the connected civil miscellaneous petition is closed.

13.02.2026

Index : Yes / No
Speaking order : Yes / No
Neutral Citation : Yes / No
dm

To

The Judicial Magistrate,
Kangayam.



WEB COPY



C.R.P.No.659 of 2026

S.SOUNTHAR, J.

dm

C.R.P.No.659 of 2026

13.02.2026