



WEB COPY



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 06-01-2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

CRL RC No. 4 of 2026

Arumugam

Petitioner(s)

Vs

The Inspector of Police
Thiruvallur Town Police Station,
Thiruvallur.

Respondent(s)

PRAYER: Criminal Revision filed under Section 438 and 442 of BNSS to set aside the order passed in Crl.M.P.No.2779 of 2025 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate No.1, Thiruvallur, dated 12.11.2025 by allowing this Criminal Revision.

For Petitioner (s): Mr.S.Palani

For Respondent(s): Mr.R.Vinothraja
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

ORDER

The revision challenges the dismissal of the petitioner's application seeking registration of FIR, on the complaint given by the petitioner.

2.The gist of the allegation in the complaint is that the proposed accused had received a sum of Rs.18,50,000/- on various dates as loan promising to



return the said amount with high rate of interest; that the proposed accused failed to return the said amount and thus committed the offences of cheating; and that when the petitioner requested the proposed accused to repay the money, he abused the petitioner in filthy language.

3.The learned Magistrate found that the allegation discloses a monetary dispute and no offence of criminal intimidation is made out and dismissed the petitioner's application.

4.The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the offences are made out; that though the petitioner is known to the proposed accused, the offence of cheating is made out; that in any case, the offences of criminal intimidation is made out; and that the learned Magistrate ought not to have examined whether the allegation is true or not.

5.This Court, on perusal of the complaint filed by the petitioner and the impugned order, finds that the allegation only discloses a monetary dispute between the petitioner and the proposed accused. The petitioner and the proposed accused were admittedly known to each other for a very long time, and there were several transactions between them. Therefore, the allegation at best discloses breach of promise and not cheating. As regards the offence of criminal intimidation, it is seen that there is no allegation suggesting real threat.



Admittedly, both the petitioner and the proposed accused were known to each other.

WEB COPY

6.Hence, this Court finds no infirmity in the impugned order and hence the revision is dismissed.

06-01-2026

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

To

1.The Judicial Magistrate No.1,
Thiruvallur.

2.The Inspector of Police
Thiruvallur Town Police Station,
Thiruvallur.



WEB COPY

4/4

CRL RC No. 4 of 2



SUNDER MOHAN, J.

sli

CRL RC No. 4 of 2026

06-01-2026