



IN THE COURT OF XXV METROPOLITAN MAGISTRATE, EGMORE,
CHENNAI-600 008.

Present: Thiru.M.Kalimuthuvel, B.Sc., M.A., LL.M.,
XXV Metropolitan Magistrate.

Friday, the 14th day of August 2026

CrI.M.P.No.6070 of 2026

in

C.C.No. 5083/2023

in

CNR.No.TNCH0F-019858-2026

A1.B. Kumaravel Pandiyan,
S/o. Dr. V. Balasubramanian,
M/s. Royaale Chennai Realtors
LVR Centre, 3rd Floor,
New No.7, Old No.4, Sheshadhri Road,
Alwarpet, Chennai – 600 018.

... Petitioner/1st Accused

/Vs./

State represented by
The Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch,
Land Grabbing Special Cell -I,
Vepery, Chennai – 600 007,
Ref: Crime No.624/2012 dated 24.12.2012
U/s. 420, 467, 468, 471, 506(II) & 120 B IPC

... Respondent/Complainant

This petition was filed on behalf of the Petitioner/1stAccused U/s.395 of
Cr.P.C. on 01.07.2026 and taken up for final hearing on 22.07.2026 before me
in the present of M/s.AB & Partners counsel for the Petitioner/1stAccused and

Assistant Public Prosecutor Counsel for the Respondent/Complainant and on perusing the petition and records this court pronounce the following.

ORDER

1. The Petitioner/1stAccused has filed the above petition under Sec.395 of Cr.P.C. to refer the question of law raised in C.C.No.5083 of 2023 pending on the file of this Hon'ble Court to the Hon'ble High Court to make final decisions.

2. Brief of the Petition Averments:-

2(i). The Petitioner/1stAccused in Cr.No.624/2012 based on the complaint dated 26.11.2012 by registering an FIR in Cr.No.624/2012 on 24.12.2010 for offences under sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 506 (ii) and 120B of IPC and taken up for investigation by the specially constituted Anti-Land Grabbing Cell which has been constituted and established based on the Government order issued in G.O.Ms.No.423 HOME (POL-XI) Department dated 28.07.2011 and G.O.Ms.No.451 HOME (Court III) Department dated 11.08.2011. The Anti Land Grabbing Cell constituted by the Government had conducted the investigation and filed a final report dated 17.03.2023 before the Hon'ble Special Court for Land Grabbing cases No.II, Allikulam Chennai – 600 003 in Connection with Crime No. 624 of 2012 for offences under sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 506 (ii) and 120B of IPC on 21.04.2023 wherein the petitioners have been arrayed as the 1st Accused. The said final report filed in connection with

Crime No.624 of 2012 has been taken on file by the Hon'ble Special Court Land Grabbing Cases No.II Allikukam, Chennai 600 003 in C.C.No.5083 of 2023.

2(ii). The legality and constitutionality in establishing special courts for the land grab cases under the banner of Anti Land Grabbing Special Cells as a Special wing and constitution of special courts for trial of such land grab cases had been questioned before the Hon'ble high court Madras in [W.P.No.](#) 18872 of 2011. The Hon'ble High Court has been pleased to pass an order dated 10.02.2015 in the said W.P.No.18872 of 2011 by which and where under the Hon'ble High Court had quashed the challenged the Government Orders issued in G.O.Ms.No.423 HOME(POL-XI) Department dated 28.07.2011 and [G.O.Ms.](#) No.451 HOME (Court III) Department dated 11.08.2011. As a consequence of that order passed by Hon'ble High Court Madras, the investigation so done and performed by Anti Land Grabbing Special cells in Crime No.624 of 2012 had become unauthorized. The judgment of the Hon'ble High Court Madras passed in [W.P.No.](#) 18872 of 2011 has been reported in the aw journal 2015 (2) CTC 1. The Government by being aggrieved by the order passed by the Hon'ble High Court in [W.P.No.](#) 18872 of 2011 dated 10.02.2015 had carried the matter to the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India by way of preferring Special Leave Petitions which were later upon grant of leave had been converted as Civil Appeal Nos. 1580-1608 of 2022.

2(iii). While admitting the above appeal preferred by the state, in the first instance, the Hon'ble Supreme Court had stayed the order passed by Hon'ble High Court Madras in W.P.No.18872 of 2011 dated 10.02.2015. In the meanwhile, pending disposal of civil Appeal Nos. 1580-1608 of 2022, transfer orders have been passed by the Hon'ble High Court Madras in Crl.O.P.No.20889 of 2019 from the file of Special Court for Land Grabbing Cases - II, Chennai to the court of CCB & CBCID Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore, Chennai on 05.08.2019 in regard to Crime No.234 of 2015. Based upon which, on mentioning by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor, High Court Madras, had transferred around 864 cases wherein final reports were filed by withdrawing the same from the file of special court for land grabbing cases. Being aggrieved by that, the Registrar General, High Court Madras had filed special leave petitions which were upon grant of leave have been registered as Criminal Appeal Nos. 272-274 of 2022 wherein a common order has been passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court by setting aside all the order of transfer passed by the Hon'ble High Court Madras while allowing the appeal in and by order dated 23.02.2022, however the said order is subject to the final orders which is yet to be passed in Criminal Appeal Nos. 1580-1608 of 2022 being correspondingly referable to SLP.C. Nos. 6050-6078 of 2015. In fine, all the cases relating Anti-land grabbing have been kept back to the file of Special court of land grabbing cases.

2(iv). As regards special courts, it is only the Hon'ble High Court would have jurisdiction for constituting and conferring jurisdiction upon special courts. The instant C.C.No.5083 of 2023 has been originally pending on the file of Special Court for exclusive trial Land Grabbing Cases No - II, Allikulam, Chennai. The Petitioner/1st Accused states that after disposal of the transfer subject cases, the main case concerning constitution of special courts for land grabbing in Civil Appeal Nos. 1580 1608 of 2022 came to be listed for final disposal. After a detailed hearing, the Hon'ble supreme Court has been pleased to pass an order dismissing the civil appeals preferred by the Government in Civil Appeal Nos. 1508 1608 of 2022 being referable correspondingly to S.L.P. (C) Nos.6050 6078 of 2015 in and by judgment dated 04.05.2023 by which and whereunder, the Hon'ble supreme Court had affirmed the order passed by Hon'ble High Court Madras in W.P.Nos. 18872 of 2011 etc. dated 10.02.2015 reported in 2015 (2) CTC 1. In fine, the very constitution of the special courts for land grabbing cases had been quashed by the Hon'ble High Court Madras which in turn was affirmed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. The said Judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India has been reported in the Law Journal in (2023) 3 SCC 251.

2(v). The instant case in Crime No.624 of 2012 was investigated by the Anti Land Grabbing Special cell 1 and final report was laid before the Special Court for land grabbing cases No II, Allikulam, Chennai on 17.03.2023. The

Hon'ble Supreme Court had disposed of the challenge taken for constitution of special courts for land grabbing cases in Civil Appeal Nos. 1580 -1608 of 2022 on 04.05.2023 subsequent to filing of final report which was on 17.03.2023. Thus, in the light of the final orders and judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India affirming the order of the Hon'ble High Court Madras quashing G.O.Ms.No.423 Home police (XI) department dated 28.07.2011 as well as G.O.Ms.No.451 (Court -III) department dated 11.08.2011, the final report filed by the Respondent Complainant in regard to Crime No.624 of 2012 had become incompetent and invalid. Thus, the cognizance taken thereon in C.C.No.5083 of 2023, Special Court for exclusive trial of land grabbing cases - I had become incorrect and unsustainable in law. Hence, the trial of C.C.No.5083 of 2023 is faced with the situation of irregularity and for want of jurisdiction in view of the order passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Civil Appeal Nos. 1580 - 1608 of 2022 dated 04.05.2023 reported in (2023) 3 SCC 251.

2(vi). It is the cardinal principles of law that the accused is to be tried in a lawful manner by the competent court of law based on a valid investigation by the lawful investigating agency. In so far as the case in Crime No.624 of 2012 is concerned, it is not validly investigated by the valid investigating agency in a lawful manner and the final report filed by the respondent herein is not sustainable in law in respect of Crime No.624 of 2012 and that therefore taking

cognizance on the final report filed by the respondent in the aforesaid Crime No.624 of 2012 as C.C.No.5083 of 2023 is ingrained with an incurable illegality. The right to have a valid and lawful trial is a right constitutionally guaranteed one which cannot be denied and deprived to the petitioner. The respondent should have in all fairness brought to the notice of this Hon'ble court before the commencement of trial held in C.C.No.5083 of 2023. The trial has commenced on 27.08.2025. This Hon'ble Court has been kept in dark by the respondent without any justification in law. The holding of trial in C.C.No.5083 of 2023 by this Hon'ble Court would be affected with lack of jurisdiction.

2(vii). Besides being in defiance of the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. Under the constitutional system of governance, all courts besides executive authorities have to regulate their respective course of business in need of the Hon'ble Supreme Court order and directions under Article 144 of the Constitution of India that apart, in so far as the subject issue is concerned, the Judgment pronounced by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in regard to specific subject of creation of a special wing of investigation for land grabbing cases and establishment of special courts in the state of Tamil Nadu would squarely govern and bind under Article 141 of the Constitution of India. Thus, both mandate of Articles 141 and 144 of the Constitution of India would squarely get attracted for the issue brought before this Hon'ble Court with regard to sustainability of holding trial in C.C.No.5083 of 2023 after the advent

of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India on 04.05.2023 reported in the Law Journal in (2023) 3 SCC 251. In this background of legal scenario surrounding competency of the trial in C.C.No.5083 of 2023 on the file of this Hon'ble Court, this Hon'ble Court is under legal obligation to seek decision from the Hon'ble High Court of Madras by invoking an appropriate measure of seeking reference as ordained U/s 395(2) of Cr.P.C before proceeding further. Pending such reference by this Hon'ble Court to the Hon'ble High Court of Madras, the interregnum course as suggested under Section 395(3) of Cr.P.C is to be adhered to. The course of which is evident from the text of the section 395(3) of Cr.P.C.

2(viii). Though there is no direct provision traceable directly for discharge of the accused under the scheme of procedure devised in the Code of Criminal Procedure 1973, at this stage after commencement of trial yet, under the circumstances, it is just and proper for this Hon'ble Court to address the situation in the face of abolition of Anti-Land Grabbing Special Cell and the Special Court constituted in that behalf with the advent of the judgment passed by the Hon'ble High Court in the case of R.Thamaraiselvan in W.P.No.18872 of 2011 dated 10.02.2015 which in turn having been affirmed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India on 04.05.2023 in Civil Appeal Nos. 1580-1608 of 2022. In this imbroglio situation of legal entanglement surrounding the trial in C.C.No.5083 of 2023, it is just and proper for this Hon'ble Court to make a

reference to the Hon'ble High Court, Madras and take decision from it since a question of law had arisen in C.C.No.5083 of 2023 as to whether the trial of which can go ahead with in the face of final judgment handed down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India reported in (2023) 7 SCC 251 on 04.05.2023 in Civil Appeal Nos. 1580-1608 of 2022 by upholding abolition of special courts for trial of land grabbing cases exclusively and quashing the constitution of special investigation wing of anti-land grab as ordered by the Hon'ble High Court of Madras, reported in 2015 (2) CTC 1. Undoubtedly, this legal problem is to be addressed without admitting any further delay in the interest of Justice and prayed to allow the petition.

3. Brief of the Counter Averments:-

3(i). The de-facto complainant preferred a complaint and since cognizable offence is made out the respondent registered a case in Crime No.624 of 2012 for the offences under sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 506[ii] & 120[B] of Indian Penal Code and on completion of investigation respondent filed a final report in C.C.No.5083 of 2023 for the offences under section 420, 467, 468, 471, 506[ii] & 120[B] of Indian Penal Code and the same is pending trial where out of 40 witnesses, 27 witnesses have been examined in chief and cross. The petition filed by the petitioner/A-1 is not at all maintainable and liable to be dismissed in limine. The details of the sec:395(2) is extracted below;

“(2) A court of session may. If thinks fit in any case pending befor which provisions of sub-section (1) do not apply, refer for the decision the High court any question of law arising in the hearing of such case”.

It is clear from the provision that the such provision does not apply to this court. Moreover, no question of law involved or referred to Hon'ble High Court. Thus, this petition is not at all maintainable in law.”

3(ii). In the interregnum, the 1st accused, preferred a petition U/S. 395 (2) Cr.P.C, seeking a reference to the Hon'ble High Court on the legality of proceeding with the trial in C.C. No. 5083 of 2023 in view of the order passed in W.P. No. 18872 of 2011 batch, as affirmed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Civil Appeal Nos. 1580-1608 of 2022. The averments and contentions contained in the affidavit filed in support of the petition filed by A1 are false, incorrect, misconceived, not maintainable in the eyes of law and are therefore denied. The case was registered on the basis of a complaint disclosing cognizable offences and, upon completion of investigation, a final report was filed before the competent Special Court. Thereafter, the case was transferred to the CCB court and upon the petition filed by the Accused persons the case is presently pending trial before this Hon'ble Court. The investigation, filing of the final report, taking of cognizance of the case were all carried out strictly in accordance with law. The proceedings presently pending before this Hon'ble Court are valid and are liable to continue in accordance with law.

3(iii). The contention that the investigation, final report and all consequential proceedings have become invalid is wholly misconceived and unsupported by law. Neither the judgments relied upon by the petitioner nor any other legal provision renders the pending prosecution invalid or bars the continuation of the trial before the competent Court. The petitioner has neither pleaded nor established any prejudice or failure of justice warranting interference by this Hon'ble Court. It is well settled that criminal proceedings cannot be stalled on mere technical objections in the absence of actual prejudice. The petitioner has suppressed the fact that the transfer of the present case to this Hon'ble Court was effected at the instance of the accused. Having participated in the proceedings before this Hon'ble Court without raising any objection, when the trial has reached its fag end, the present petition is filed to protract the trial and delay its logical conclusion. The Respondent/Complainant states that the trial in the present case is being conducted pursuant to the directions of the Hon'ble High Court for its expeditious disposal within the time stipulated by the Hon'ble High Court as during a certain period the Accused person was delaying the trial. Also, the petitioner has approached various judicial forums in connection with the present proceedings on several occasions. However, at no point of time did the petitioner raise the present contention regarding the alleged invalidity of the investigation, the final report or the jurisdiction of the trial Court.

3(iv). The petition filed under Section 395(2) Cr.P.C. is wholly misconceived and not maintainable. No question arises in the present case warranting a reference to the Hon'ble High Court under the said provision. The present proceedings are pending before a Court of competent jurisdiction and there exists no legal impediment for continuation of the trial. The petition is devoid of merit and is liable to be dismissed. The present petition has been filed only to protract the proceedings and delay the conclusion of the trial going in a brisk pace by raising untenable objections. The petition deserves to be dismissed in limine.

4. Both sides not produced oral and documentary evidence in this petition.

5. Both sides heard and records perused.

6. Point for determination:-

6(i). Whether the petition is allowed or not to be decided ?

6(ii). The Petitioner/1st Accused filed this petition u/s. 395(2) of Cr.P.C. to pass order seeking a reference for decision to be Hon'ble High Court of Madras in connection with the trial of the case in the light of the fact situation emerged resulting in quashing of constitution of special investigation team for Anti-Land Grabbing and constitution of Special Courts for trial of Land Grabbing cases exclusively in W.P.No.18872/2021 dated 10.02.2015 and in turn have been confirmed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Civil Appeal Nos.10580-10608 of 2022 dated 04.05.2023.

6(iii). The learned counsel for petitioner contended that, the Hon'ble High Court of Madras quashed the following G.O.Ms.No.423 Home (POL-XI) Department dated 28.07.2011 and G.O.Ms.No.451 Home (Court III) Department dated 11.08.2011 by order passed dated 10.02.2015 in W.P.No.18872/2011. As a consequence of that order passed by the Hon'ble High Court at Madras the investigation done and performed by Anti land grabbing special cell in Cr.No.624/2012 had become unauthorized. The learned counsel further contended that the government by being aggrieved by the order by the Hon'ble High Court in W.P.No.18872/2011 dated 10.02.2015 had carried a matter to Hon'ble Supreme court of India by way of preferring special leave petition and the case was converted as Civil Appeal No.1580-1608 of 2022 and appeal allowed and the same appeal was dismissed. According to above two judgment the court as no power to conduct the case and in this circumstance, it is necessary to seek reference, whether this case is affected the above Apex court is order and to be closed without full pledged trial? to the Hon'ble High Court of Madras and prayed to allow the petition.

6(iv). The learned petitioner counsel supporting his arguments filed Apex court judgments, which is reported in 2023 (7 Supreme Court Cases 251), the Government of Tamil Nadu and Others Vs R.Thamaraiselvam and Others,

i). Constitution of India – Article 14 – Vague definitions and classification in creation of offence(s) and conferment of unguided power to

investigate the same, that too by government order rather than legislation – Held, sufficient for invalidation of the same. Land grabbing cases – Setting aside government order dealing with such cases – When warranted – Though, by the GO in question, the Government of Tamil Nadu constituted/formed 36 Anti-Land Grabbing Special Cells to deal with the land grabbing cases, but the type of cases that could be said to be land grabbing cases, but the type of cases that could be said to be land grabbing cases found not defined nor mentioned in the said GO – No clear definition of “land grabbing”.

ii). Held, in absence of any guidelines and/or definition as to which cases can be said to be land grabbing cases, it gives unfettered and unguided and arbitrary powers to the police to treat any land case as a land grabbing case which will be investigated by the Anti-Land Grabbing Special Cell - Further, held, even a dispute between two private persons which may be under the Specific Relief Act and/or Transfer of Property Act may be considered as a land grabbing case like in the Criminal Appeal in which a civil suit was pending for specific performance which was dismissed for non-prosecution and thereafter the defendant filed a complaint/FIR for the offences under IPC.

6(v). The learned APP contended that the petition is not maintainable and in this case already charge sheet filed and commenced trial as per the Hon’ble High Court of Madras and also 27 witnesses as examined on the prosecution side and it has to be examined 7 witnesses only in this case on the prosecution

side. The learned counsel further contended that the petitioner filed this petition with intention to drag on the proceeding and there is no merit in this petition and need not send reference to the Hon'ble High Court. Therefore, this petition is dismissed with exemplary cost.

6(vi). Both side heard and perused records. It is revealed that, originally, this case FIR was registered the Sub Inspector of Police, CCB Team IV, Egmore, Chennai, based upon the complaint given by the defacto complainant Mr.A.Mahadevan for alleged offence u/ss.420, 467, 468, 471, 506(ii) and 420(b) of IPC after that the case was investigated the respondent and completion of investigation and the charge sheet filed before the Special Judicial Magistrate (Land Grabbing case) No.II, Allikulam, Chennai -03 and after taking cognizable of the case. The Special Judicial Magistrate (Land Grabbing) Court No.I, Allikulam, Chennai-03 after that the case was transferred from CBCID Court to this court by the order of Chief Judicial Magistrate in CrI.M.P.No.68190/2024, dated 16.12.2024 and also the Hon'ble High Court of Madras directed the trial court dispose the case within 9 months in CrI.O.P.No.4670/2024 dated 28.02.2024.

6(vii). As per direction of Hon'ble High court this court has been conducting the trial in speedy manner and out of 40 witnesses examined 27 witnesses and marked Ex.P1 to 146 and remaining only 7 witnesses on the prosecution side. At this juncture the petitioner came up this petition stating that

the G.O.(M.S.) No.423 Home (POL-XI) Department dated 28.07.2011 and G.O. MS.No.451 Home (Court) III department dated 11.08.2011 and GO are quashed and abolished the constitution of land grabbing special cell and land grabbing court and also the cases filed Land Grabbing Special Cell were quashed. In this circumstance, the Petitioner/1st Accused filed this petition contended that whether the court has power to conduct the case in respect of the land grabbing offences and it is not decided by the Hon'ble High Court of Madras and Supreme Court of India. Therefore, this petitioner filed this petition to seeking permission to refer the matter to the Hon'ble High Court of Madras for deciding a legal point arose in this case.

6(viii). The Petitioner/1st Accused did not produced document or order copy specially this case Crime number (624/2012) was quashed by the division bench of the Hon'ble High Court of Madras. It is an undisputed fact that G.O.Ms.No.423 dated 28.07.2011 was struck down on constitutional grounds (Articles 14 and 21). However, a careful reading of the judgment of the Division Bench of the Hon'ble High Court of Madras (Land Grabbing Cases Bench) as well as the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reveals that the quashing of the Executive Order only declared the Special Courts and Special Executive Cells unconstitutional.

6(ix). The Apex Court explicitly held in Para 44 that:

“It is always open to the aggrieved person either to file a private complaint or file a complaint before the concerned police. The said remedy available to the person aggrieved is independent..”

In the instant case, the investigation was conducted by the Central Crime Branch (CCB), Vepery, Chennai. CCB is an integral, statutory investigation agency under the regular police department empowered to investigate offences under Chapter XVII and XVIII of the Indian Penal Code.

6(x). Once the Special Courts ceased to exist, the case files were placed before the regular Magistrate Court possessing territorial and subject-matter jurisdiction under section 190(1) (b) of Cr.P.C. Taking cognizance of IPC offences on a final report filed by a regular police agency is perfectly valid. The procedural transfer does not erase the substantive offences committed under IPC Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 506(ii) and 420(b) of IPC. Hence, this petition filed by the Petitioner / 1st Accused is legally devoid of merit.

6(xi). On perusal of above Apex court judgment, it is revealed that, there is no bar to proceed the case, upon the individually present complaint in jurisdiction court. Considering the facts and circumstance, the petitioner stated reasons are not acceptable and satisfiable to refer the issue to the Hon’ble High Court of Madras for deciding legal point and also the Petitioner/1stAccused cannot invoke provision u/s. 395 of Cr.P.C.

6(xii). For better appreciation the relevant provision of law is extracted hereunder section 395 in the code of criminal procedure, 1973,

395. Reference to High Court.

1) Where any court is satisfied that a case pending before it involves a question as to the validity of any act, ordinance or regulation or of any provision contained in an act, ordinance or regulation, the determination of which is necessary for the disposal of the case, and is of opinion that such act, ordinance, regulation or provision is invalid or inoperative, but has not been so declared by the High Court to which that court is subordinate or by the Supreme Court, the Court shall state a case setting out its opinion and the reasons therefor, and refer the same for the decision of the High Court. Explanation – In this section "Regulation" means any Regulation as defined in the General Clauses Act, 1897 (10 of 1897), or in the General Clauses Act of a State.

2) A Court of Session or a Metropolitan Magistrate may, if it or he thinks fit in any case pending before it or him to which the provisions of subsection (1) do not apply refer for the decision of the High Court any question of law arising in the hearing of such case.

3) Any court making a reference to the High Court under subsection (1) or subsection (2) may pending the decision of the High Court thereon either commit the accused to jail or release him on bail to appear when called upon.

From the said provision, it is clear that the 1st accused cannot invoke the said provision and it is only the concerned court can invoke the power under this provision.

6(xiii). In this regard, I relied the decision of Hon'ble High Court of Madras in A.Syed Ibrahim @ Bhai vs State Rep. By The Superintendent of

Police, HOB/CBI/ACB/Madurai and 2 others, decided on 21 February, 2022, it has been held that,

10. The accused cannot invoke Section 395 Cr.P.C., and it is only the concerned Court can invoke the power under Section 395 Cr.P.C. Thus, the accused persons without any merit, filed the petition in Crl.M.P.No.15471 of 2021 in S.C.No.34 of 2020 and the same was rightly dismissed by the trial Court, by order, dated 24.09.2021, which is well reasoned and detailed one and the same is hereby confirmed. Accordingly, this Criminal Revision Case stands dismissed. The Hon'ble Apex Court as on date not questioned the formation, function and power of the Central Bureau of Investigation to investigate the cases.

6(xiv). From the above discussion, this court is inclined to dismiss the above petition filed by the Petitioner/1st Accused cannot be invoked the said provision in view of the decision in A.Syed Ibrahim @ Bhai vs State Rep. By The Superintendent of Police, HOB/CBI/ACB/Madurai and 2 others, as stated supra.

7. In the result, the petition is dismissed.

This order was dictated by me to the Steno-typist and directly typed by her in computer, then corrected and pronounced by me in the Open Court, this the 14th day of August 2026.

XXV Metropolitan Magistrate,
Egmore, Chennai -8.

Appendix:

1. Petitioner/1st Accused Side Witness - NIL
2. Petitioner/1st Accused Side Exhibits - NIL
3. Petitioner/1st Accused Side Material Objects - NIL
4. Respondent/Complainant Side Witness - NIL
5. Respondent/Complainant Side Exhibits - NIL
6. Respondent/Complainant Side Material Objects – NIL

**XXV Metropolitan Magistrate,
Egmore, Chennai -8.**