



WEB COPY

CRP No. 371 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 02-02-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE S. SOUNTHAR

CRP No. 371 of 2026 and

CMP Nos.2122 and 2124 of 2026

1. N.Mathaiyan Alias Tirunavukkarasu
S/o. Narayanasamy,
Res. at No. 150, Moongilpalayam,
Anthiyur, Erode - 635 501.
2. T. Padma @ Thirumayammal
W/o. N. Mathaiyan @ Thirunavukkarasu,
Res. at No. 150, Moongilpalayam,
Anthiyur, Erode - 635 501.
3. T. Tamilarasu
S/o. N. Mathaiyan @ Tirunavukkarasu,
No.415, Palakad Main Road,
Shri Meenakshi Hospital,
Kuniyamuthur Post, Coimbatore - 641 008.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. C. Haripriya, W/o. Pugazhenthii,
No.25, Thiru.Vi.Ka.Road, Amma Pettai,
Salem - 636 003.
2. T. Pugazhenthii, S/o. N. Mathiyan @
Thirunavukkarasu,
No.150, Moongilpalayam,
Anthiyur, Erode - 635 501.
(No Relief Sought against the 2nd respondent,
Hence Notice may be dispensed)

..Respondent(s)



Prayer: Civil Revision Petition filed under Article 227 of Constitution of India to call for the records pertaining to DVC No.3 of 2025 pending on the file of the Learned Additional Mahila Court at Salem and strike out the petitioners name by allowing the CRP.

For Petitioner(s): Mr. S.Manjukanth

ORDER

This Civil Revision Petition is filed seeking to strike off the complaint preferred by the first respondent against the petitioners.

2. The petitioners 1 and 2 herein are the parents in-law and the 3rd petitioner is brother in-law of the first respondent and she filed the above said complaint against the petitioners as well as the 2nd respondent under the provisions of the Domestic Violence Act.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the allegations made by the first respondent in the complaint are very vague and baseless and in the absence of specific allegations against the petitioners, the Magistrate ought not to have issued process against the petitioners.



4. In view of the Law settled by this Court in *Arul Daniel and Others Versus Suganya reported in (2022) SCC Online Mad 5435*, if the petitioners are aggrieved by the initiation of the proceedings under the Domestic Violence Act, it is for them to move the very same Magistrate raising preliminary issues.

The relevant observation of Full Bench 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 Constitution.*



Hence, this court is not inclined to exercise its Supervisory Power available under Article 227 of Constitution of India to strike off the complaint.

WEB COPY

5. Accordingly, this civil revision petition is dismissed. The petitioners are at liberty to move the concerned Magistrate for getting appropriate remedy as per law laid down in *Arul Daniel case*. Taking into consideration the proceedings initiated before the learned Magistrate is predominantly civil in nature, the personal appearance of the petitioners during enquiry before Magistrate is dispensed with, unless their personal appearance is absolutely necessary. There shall be no order as to costs. Connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

02-02-2026

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

MST

To

The Additional Mahila Court, Salem.



WEB COPY

CRP No. 371 of 2



S.SOUNTHAR, J.

MST

CRP No. 371 of 2026

02-02-2026