



-1-

CrI.M.P.No.2564 of 2025

IN THE COURT OF THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE, KARAIKUDI

PRESENT: THIRU. J.KARMEGAKANNAN, B.A., B.L.,

Judicial Magistrate, Karaikudi

Monday, the 23rd day of March 2026

CrI.M.P.No.2564 of 2025

In

C.C.No.1489 of 2022

CNR No.TNSV19 – 004 – 910 – 2025

Arivuselvi,

D/o.Thirunavukkarasu,

W/o.Kumar,

Door No.706,

Nesavalur colony, Managiri Post,

Karaikudi Taluk,

Sivagangai District.

..... Petitioner/Complainant

-vs-

Sathu Ramesh,

Inspector of Police,

Kallal Police Station,

Sivagangai District.

Now At

Inspector of Police,

Anna Nagar Police Station,

Madurai District.

.....Respondent/Accused



This petition is coming on 23.03.2026 for final consideration before me, in the presence of counsel Thiru.S.Rajaram for the Petitioners and Respondents side Advocate of Thiru.R.Ramasamy and upon hearing petitioner side, and perusing the case records, this court delivered the following:

ORDER

1.This petition has been filed by the petitioner/complainant under Section 254(2) of Cr.P.C seeking permission to examine herself further and also to examine one Vasanthi, Superintendent of Police, Sivagangai, Deputy Inspector General of Police, Ramanathapuram Division, and the Signature and Fingerprint Expert attached to Government Medical College, Madurai, as witnesses on her side.

2. The case of the petitioner is that she is a practicing advocate and her father is a social activist. According to her, on 08.02.2018, she had been to Kallal Police Station in connection with a case relating to her client. At that time, the respondent/accused, who was then serving as Inspector of Police in the said station, allegedly used disrespectful words and asked her to warn her father. It is further alleged that the respondent/accused fabricated certain documents portraying her father as an insane person and, on that basis, lodged false complaints before higher authorities. Aggrieved by the same, the



petitioner initiated proceedings alleging offences punishable under Sections 467, 468, 471, 470, 420 and 101 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. It is seen from the records that the petitioner initially approached this Court under Section 156(3) of Cr.P.C seeking investigation. However, the same was taken on file as a private complaint under Section 200 of Cr.P.C. Thereafter, the sworn statement of the petitioner was recorded and she was examined as P.W.1. The case now stands posted for further evidence on the side of the complainant. In the present petition, the petitioner seeks permission to examine the above said witnesses contending that their evidence is necessary for proper adjudication of the case.

4. On the other hand, the respondent/accused has filed a counter affidavit in CrI.M.P.No.2563 of 2025 filed under Section 319 of Cr.P.C, and the same has been adopted in this petition also. However, on a perusal of the counter, it is seen that there is no specific objection or contention raised with regard to the present petition seeking permission to examine additional witnesses.

5. Heard the learned counsel appearing on either side and perused the entire materials available on record.

6. It is the submission of the petitioner that since her original petition filed under Section 156(3) of Cr.P.C was converted into a private complaint



under Section 200 of Cr.P.C, she is entitled to adduce necessary evidence in support of her case, and therefore she seeks permission to examine the witnesses mentioned in the petition.

7. At this juncture, it is relevant to note that under section 254(2) of Cr.P.C, this court has the discretion to permit the complainant to summon and examine any witness, if such examination appears to be necessary for the just decision of the case. However, the petitioner must satisfy the court that the proposed witnesses are relevant and their evidence would materially assist the court in arriving at a just conclusion.

8. In the present case, though the petitioner has sought permission to examine several officials including higher police authorities and an expert witness, she has not clearly set out in her petition as to how the evidence of each of these witnesses is relevant to the issues involved in the case or in what manner their testimony would assist the court in determining the truth of the allegations.

9. Further, it is an admitted position that the petitioner has already been examined as P.W.1 and the case is now posted for her side further evidence. At this stage, when she seeks to examine higher officials such as the Superintendent of Police and Deputy Inspector General of Police, it was incumbent upon her to assign specific and convincing reasons demonstrating



the necessity of their examination. In the absence of such particulars, this court is unable to come to the conclusion that their examination is essential for the just decision of the case.

10. However, insofar as the second proposed witness is concerned, it is stated that she is none other than the mother of the petitioner. Hence, considering the nature of the allegations and the background of the case, this court is of the view that the evidence of the said witness may have some relevance in supporting the version of the petitioner.

11. In the result, this petition is partly allowed. The petitioner is permitted to examine the second proposed witness alone. In respect of the remaining witnesses, the petition stands dismissed.

Order pronounced by me in the open Court on the 23rd day of March 2026.

Judicial Magistrate,
Karaikudi.