



WEB COPY



Crl.M.P.No.24536 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 30.01.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE **SUNDER MOHAN**

Crl.M.P.No.24536 of 2025
in Crl.R.C.Sr.No.101345 of 2025

Ishwarya Lakshmi

...

Petitioner

Vs.

1.Priya @ Sivaranjani

2.The State of Tamilnadu rep by
The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Neyveli, Cuddalore District,
in Crime No.9 of 2024.

...

Respondents

Prayer: Criminal Miscellaneous Petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS Act, 2023, to condone the delay of 91 days against the order dated 19.06.2025 passed in CMP.No.1083 of 2024 on the file of learned Principal District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Kurunjipadi in filing the present Criminal Revision Petition in Crl.R.C.SR.No.101345 of 2025.

For Petitioner	: Mr.K.Jeyamohan
For Respondent	: Mr.K.Senthilkumar for R1 Mr.R.Vinothraja, Government Advocate (Crl. Side) for R2



Crl.M.P.No.24536 of 2025

ORDER

WEB COPY

The Revision challenges the order allowing the protest petition filed by the first respondent herein against the final report filed by the second respondent. The instant Petition has been filed to condone the delay of 91 days in filing the Revision.

2.The learned counsel for the first respondent would submit that the pursuant to the order passed in the protest petition, the final report was filed and the learned Magistrate has taken cognizance of the offence, framed charges and posted the matter for trial.

3.The learned counsel for the petitioner however, would submit that the petitioner had not been accused by the first respondent; that she was not an accused in the FIR; and the learned Magistrate erred in allowing the protest petition filed by the first respondent.

4.Though the petition is at the stage of condoning the delay, in view of the aforesaid facts, no useful purpose would be served in condoning the delay and hearing the Revision, in view of the order that this Court proposes to pass.



Crl.M.P.No.24536 of 2025

5.It is seen from the records that after the protest petition was allowed, the trial Court has taken cognizance of the offence as against the petitioner as well. Therefore, this Court is not inclined to interfere at this stage, since the charges have already been framed. However, liberty is granted to the petitioner to seek appropriate remedy, if there is no evidence against the petitioner for framing charges.

6.With the above observations, the petition is dismissed at this stage.

30.01.2026

Index : Yes/No
Internet : Yes/No
Neutral Citation : Yes/No
Speaking order/Non-speaking order
Tsg

To

1.The Principal District Munsif
cum Judicial Magistrate, Kurunjipadi.

2.The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Neyveli, Cuddalore District,
in Crime No.9 of 2024.

3.The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court.

3/4



WEB COPY



Crl.M.P.No.24536 of 2025

SUNDER MOHAN, J.,

Tsg

Crl.M.P.No.24536 of 2025
in Crl.R.C.Sr.No.101345 of 2025

30.01.2026