

Suresh vs Ramya Devi

Suresh vs Ramya Devi

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1735653

Court : Chennai Orders

Decided On : Oct-30-2025

Judge : Honourable Mr.Justice S. Sounthar

Appeal No. : CRP/537/2024

Appellant : Suresh

Respondent : Ramya Devi

Judgement :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 30-10-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S. SOUNTHAR CRP No. 537 of 2024 and CMP No.2628 of 2024

1. SURESH S/o.Annamalai, 13/42, Chetty Street, Kumananchavadi, Kundrathur Road, Petitioner(s) Poonamallee, Chennai Vs

1. Ramya Devi

W/o.Suresh, D/o.Natarajan, Cheyyar, Tiruvannamalai District
2.ANNAMALAI S/o.Vethachelam, 13/42, Chetty Street, 3.MALA
W/o.Annamalai, 13/42, Chetty Street, 4.MANIKANDAN S/o.Annamalai,
13/42, Chetty Street, 1 of 5 5.SANGEETHA W/o.Palani, No.72,
Sengunthar Street, VTC Palaseevaram, Palaseevaram, Kancheepuram
District (Respondents 2 to 5 are no necessary parties to file a Civil
Revision petition Respondent(s) hence notice may be dispense with)
PRAYER: Civil Revision Petition filed under Article 227 of Constitution of
India to call for the records pertaining to the petition in DVC No.10 of
2022 pending on the file of the Learned Judicial Magistrate, Cheyyar and
strike out the petitioners name and the same as abuse process of law
and quash the same by allowing the present CRP. For Petitioner(s): Mr.
T.Muruganantham

ORDER

This Civil Revision Petition is filed seeking to strike of the complaint preferred by the first respondent under the provision of the Domestic Violence Act. nd rd

2. The petitioner is husband of the first respondent. The 2 and 3

th th respondents are parents and 4 and 5 respondents are siblings of the petitioner. The first respondent filed a complaint against the petitioner and the respondents 2 of 5

2 to 5 under the domestic violence Act in DVC No.10 of 2022 on the file of Judicial Magistrate, Cheyyar. After receipt of notice, the petitioner filed this civil revision petition seeking to strike of the said complaint, mainly on the ground that the averments made in the above complaint are not sufficient to take cognizance by the Magistrate regarding the allegations raised under the Domestic Violence Act.

3. In view of the Law settled by this Court Arul Daniel and Others

Versus Suganya reported in (2022) SCC Online Mad 5435, if the petitioner is

aggrieved by the initiation of the proceedings under the Domestic Violence Act, it is for him to move the very same Magistrate raising preliminary issues like absence of shared house hold, domestic violence, etc. Hence, this court is not inclined to exercise its Supervisory Power available under Article 227 of Constitution of India to strike off the complaint.

4. Accordingly, this civil revision petition is dismissed. There shall be no

**order as to costs. Connected miscellaneous petition is closed.
The petitioner is**

at liberty to move the concerned Magistrate for getting appropriate remedy as per law laid down in Arun Daniel case. 30-10-2025 Internet: yes Index: Yes/No Neutral citation: Yes/No MST 3 of 5 To The District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Pochampalli, Krishnagiri District. 4 of 5 S.SOUNTCHAR J. MST 30-10-2025 5 of 5

SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com