

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE T. SUNIL CHOWDARY

CRIMINAL PETITION No.12251 of 2015

ORDER:

This Criminal Petition is filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. by the petitioners (respondent Nos.1 and 2 in DVC) to quash the proceedings in D.V.C.No.18 of 2014 (for short, 'DVC') on the file of the III Metropolitan Magistrate, Erramanzil, Hyderabad.

2. A perusal of the record reveals that the first respondent filed a petition under Section 12 of the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act against the petitioners claiming various reliefs under the Act. The learned Magistrate after taking the case on file numbered the same as DVC 18 of 2014 and issued summons to the respondents.

3. As per the principle enunciated in Valisetti Chandra Rekha v. State of Andhra Pradesh, Mohit Yadam v. State of Andhra Pradesh **and** Mohd. Akber Yaseen v. Rizwana Sultana, the reliefs sought under Sections 18 to 22 of the Act are purely civil in nature and there is no element of criminality.

4. In the instant case also the reliefs sought by the first respondent are purely civil in nature without any element of criminality. Whether the first respondent is entitled to claim reliefs against the petitioners or not has to be decided during the course of trial only. A perusal of the record reveals the role played by the petitioners. If this Court expresses any opinion touching the merits of the case, the same will cause prejudice to either of the parties. In such circumstances, the maintainability of the present petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is very much doubtful.

5. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case and also the principle enunciated in the cases cited supra, I am of the considered view that it is not a fit case to quash the proceedings against the petitioners/respondent Nos.1 and 2 in DVC.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the second petitioner is staying at Bangalore, therefore, she is facing much difficulty to attend the trial Court on each and every date of adjournment. Hence, their presence may be dispensed with.

7. There is no dispute with regard to the identity of petitioner No.2. Even if the presence of petitioner No.2 is dispensed with, no prejudice would be caused to the first respondent.

8. Hence, the presence of petitioner No.2, who is respondent No.2 in D.V.C.No.18 of 2014 on the file of the III Metropolitan Magistrate, at Erramanzil, Hyderabad, is hereby dispensed with on each and every date of adjournment. However, the petitioner No.2 shall appear before the trial Court as and when her presence is so required.

9. With the above observation, the Criminal Petition is dismissed.

10. Consequently, Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in this Criminal Petition shall stand closed.

-

-

T. SUNIL CHOWDARY, J

Date:24.11.2015

Rns

-