



CNR: KAHC010144332024

NC: 2026:KHC:51708
CRL.P No. 2505 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 21ST DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH RAI K

CRIMINAL PETITION NO. 2505 OF 2024

BETWEEN:

SURESHMATI DEVI
AGED ABOUT 78 YEARS,
WIFE OF LATE VISHVAMBARASING,
NO.1386/W2 NEAR SAROJINI
HOSPITAL OPPOSITE,
KID GEM,
BARAK KANPUR CITY,
UTTAR PRADESH - 208 027.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. HARSHITH N BALAKRISHNA, ADVOCATE)

Digitally signed
by PANKAJA S
Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY
GANGAMMAGUDI POLICE STATION
REPRESENTED BY STATE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
HIGH COURT BUILDING
BANGALORE - 560 001
2. NEHA CHAUHAN
AGED ABOUT 32 YEARS
W/O ANKIT SINGH BHADAURIA,
RESIDING AT NO 11,
3RD MAIN, 2ND CROSS, K.G HALLI,
JALAHALLI WEST,



CNR: KAHC010144332024

NC: 2026:KHC:51708
CRL.P No. 2505 of 2024

BENGALURU - 560 015
KARNATAKA

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. MAHESHA P, HCGP FOR R1,
SRI. BALAJI PRASAD .H, ADVOCATE FOR
SMT. SUNITHA H SINGH, ADVOCATE FOR R2)

THIS CRL.P IS FILED U/S.482 OF CR.P.C BY THE ADVOCATE FOR THE PETITIONER PRAYING THAT THIS HONOURABLE COURT MAY BE PLEASED TO QUASH THE FIR, COMPLIANT REGISTERED IN CR.NO.63/2023 CHARGE SHEET DATED 23.08.2023 IN C.C.NO.21223/2023 FILED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.1 (GANGAMMAGUDI P.S.,) AND ALL FURTHER PROCEEDINGS IN ANNEXURE A AND B FOR THE OFFENCE P/US.498-A,323,324,504,506 R/W SEC.34 OF IPC 1860 AND SEC.3 AND 4 OF DP ACT 1961 AS AGAINST THE PETITIONER HEREIN ANNEXURE C.

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR ADMISSION, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH RAI K

ORAL ORDER

This petition is filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C seeking to quash proceedings against the petitioner/accused No.2 in C.C.No.21223/2023 (arising out of Crime No.63/2023 registered by Gangamma Gudi Police Station), pending on the file I ACMM, Bengaluru (for short, 'learned Magistrate'), for the offences punishable under Sections 489A, 323, 324, 504,



506 r/w Section 34 of IPC and Sections 3 and 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 (for short, 'the DP Act').

2. The brief facts of the case, as borne out from the complaint and charge sheet materials, are that respondent No.2 lodged a complaint before respondent No.1-Police on 10.06.2023 against the petitioner and accused No.1, alleging that her marriage with accused No.1-Ankith Singh was solemnized on 15.07.2021. It is alleged that, at the time of marriage, accused No.1 and the petitioner, who is the mother-in-law of respondent No.2, demanded dowry in the form of cash and gold ornaments, which demand was fulfilled by the parents of respondent No.2.

3. After the marriage, the marital relationship between respondent No.2 and accused No.1 was cordial for a few months. Thereafter, accused No.1 and the petitioner allegedly started demanding an additional dowry of Rs.20,00,000/-. When respondent No.2 expressed her inability to meet the said demand due to her financial condition, they allegedly subjected her to both physical and mental harassment and abused her in filthy language. It is further alleged that, despite respondent



CNR: KAHC010144332024

NC: 2026:KHC:51708
CRL.P No. 2505 of 2024

No.2 and her family members advising accused No.1 and the petitioner not to indulge in such acts, they continued the alleged harassment.

4. On 26.12.2022, due to the alleged unbearable harassment meted out by her husband and petitioner - mother-in-law, respondent No.2 left the matrimonial home. Thereafter, she lodged the complaint before respondent No.1-Police. On the basis of the said complaint, respondent No.1-Police registered a case against the petitioner and the other accused for the offences stated supra. Upon completion of investigation, the police laid the charge sheet against the petitioner and accused No.1, arraigning the petitioner as accused No.2 for the aforesaid offences. The learned Magistrate thereafter took cognizance of the said offences. Being aggrieved by the same, the petitioner is before this Court.

5. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, learned HCGP for respondent No.1-State and learned counsel for respondent No.2.



CNR: KAHC010144332024

6. The primary contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that, the petitioner-accused No.2 being the mother-in-law of respondent No.2, is aged about 78 years and has no connection with the allegations made in the complaint. It is contended that the alleged dowry in the form of cash and gold ornaments was received by accused No.1, the husband of respondent No.2. Further, it is submitted that a perusal of the complaint averments and the statements of the witnesses recorded during the investigation would disclose that, during the period of respondent No.2's stay with accused No.1, it was accused No.1 who allegedly subjected her to harassment for additional dowry. Except for certain omnibus allegations, there are no specific allegations against the petitioner attributing any overt act to her. Hence, it is contended that continuation of the proceedings against the petitioner would be unwarranted and the same are liable to be quashed. Accordingly, he prays to allow the petition.

7. *Per contra*, the learned counsel for respondent No.2 contended that the charge sheet materials disclose that, from the inception of the marriage, the petitioner, being the mother-



CNR: KAHC010144332024

in-law of respondent No.2, along with accused No.1, her son, subjected respondent No.2 to both physical and mental harassment in connection with the demand for additional dowry. It is further contended that the averments in the complaint contain specific allegations against the petitioner with regard to the acts of harassment allegedly committed by her against respondent No.2. The said allegations are also corroborated by the statements of the material witnesses, including the family members and eyewitnesses. In such circumstances, it is contended that the proceedings against the petitioner cannot be quashed at this stage. Accordingly, he for dismissal of the petition.

8. Learned HCGP for respondent No.1-State also opposed the prayer of the petitioner, contending that the allegations in the charge sheet, *prima facie*, disclose sufficient material against the petitioner to proceed with the case. Accordingly, he prays for dismissal of the petition.

9. I have given my anxious consideration to the submission made by the learned counsel for the respective parties so also perused the entire materials on record.



CNR: KAHC010144332024

NC: 2026:KHC:51708
CRL.P No. 2505 of 2024

10. As could be gathered from records, the averments in the complaint clearly disclose that, at the time of marriage, accused No.1 and the petitioner, being the husband and mother-in-law of respondent No.2 respectively, demanded dowry. It is further alleged that, after the marriage, respondent No.2 resided in the matrimonial home at Kanpur along with accused No.1 and the petitioner. During the said period, both of them allegedly subjected respondent No.2 to physical and mental harassment in connection with the demand for additional dowry. The complaint sets out the specific incidents of such alleged harassment in detail.

11. The said allegations are further supported by the statements of the material witnesses, including the family members of respondent No.2 and their neighbours. Thus, the complaint and the charge sheet materials disclose specific allegations against the petitioner and are not confined to mere omnibus allegations. In such circumstances, this Court, while exercising jurisdiction under Section 482 of Cr.P.C., cannot conduct a mini trial or undertake a detailed examination of the evidentiary value of the allegations. The assertions made in the



CNR: KAHC010144332024

NC: 2026:KHC:51708
CRL.P No. 2505 of 2024

complaint and the statements of the witnesses are matters to be tested during the course of trial.

12. It is also relevant to note that the petitioner, being the mother-in-law of respondent No.2, was residing along with accused No.1 and respondent No.2 in the matrimonial home. Therefore, at this stage, the specific allegations made against the petitioner, supported by the statements of the material witnesses, cannot be brushed aside. Hence, the proceedings against the petitioner do not warrant interference at this stage. Accordingly, the petition, being devoid of merits, is ***dismissed***.

13. It is made clear that the observations made in this petition shall not come in the way while disposing the case before the Trial Court.

**SD/-
(RAJESH RAI K)
JUDGE**

CR
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 12