

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P.D.RAJAN

WEDNESDAY, THE 5TH DAY OF AUGUST 2015/14TH SRAVANA, 1937

Crl.Rev.Pet.No. 932 of 2003 ( )

-----  
AGAINST THE JUDGMENT IN CC 421/1999 of C.J.M.PATHANAMTHITTA  
DATED 11-10-2002

REVISION PETITIONER(S)/DEFACTO COMPLAINANT:

-----  
SUJA R. VARGHESE,  
D/O. P.G. VARGHESE,  
PULICKAMADATHIL HOUSE,  
VAZHARMANGALAM P.O.,  
CHENGANNUR.

BY ADVS.SRI.JOHN BRITTO  
SRI.C.A.RAJEEV

RESPONDENT(S)/ACCUSED AND STATE:

- 
1. REJI VARGHESE,  
S/O. GHEEVARGHESE,  
REJI BHAVAN, CHITTOOR MURI,  
PATHANAMTHITTA VILLAGE.
  2. SUCY GHEEVARGHESE  
W/O. GHEEVARGHESE,  
REJI BHAVAN, CHITTOOR MURI,  
PATHANAMTHITTA VILLAGE.
  3. STATE OF KERALA REPRESENTED BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR  
HIGH COURT OF KERALA, ERNAKULAM.

BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR SMT. SEENA RAMAKRISHNAN

THIS CRIMINAL REVISION PETITION HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD  
ON 05-08-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE  
FOLLOWING:

acd

**P.D. RAJAN, J.**

-----  
Crl.R.P.No.932 of 2003  
-----

Dated this the 5<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2015

**ORDER**

This revision petition is preferred against the judgment in C.C.No.421/1999 of Chief Judicial Magistrate, Pathanamthitta. The revision petitioner is the defacto complainant and respondents 1 and 2 are the accused in the above case. The defacto complainant's allegation was that the accused with the common intention, demanded more money as dowry and they misappropriated a sum of ₹ 2,80,000/- from the Fixed Deposit of PW1 and subjected her to cruelty, thereby committed offence punishable u/s.406 and 498A r/w.34 IPC. The trial Court examined PW1 to PW5 and marked Exts.P1 to P6. Ext.D1 was marked on the

side of the accused. The incriminating circumstances brought out in evidence were denied by the accused, while questioning them u/s.313 Cr.P.C. The trial Court, after sifting and weighing the evidence on record, acquitted the accused in the above case. Against that, this revision petition preferred.

2. After filing this revision petition, several directions were given to the revision petitioner to take steps against respondents 1 and 2. Even after such direction, no steps were taken by the revision petitioner. I have perused the judgment of the Court below. The evidence was properly analysed by the trial Court. In view of the above discussion of the trial Court, I am of the opinion that the trial Court has rightly acquitted the accused for offence punishable u/s.498A and 406 r/w. 34

IPC. Therefore, there is no merit in this revision petition and it is dismissed accordingly.

**P.D. RAJAN, JUDGE.**

acd

