

**HONOURABLE Dr. JUSTICE B.SIVA SANKARA RAO**

**Criminal Petition No.5312 of 2015**

**ORDER:**

This petition is filed by the petitioners/A.2 to A.8 under Section 482 Cr.P.C. seeking to quash the proceedings in Crime No.118 of 2014 of Women Police Station, Vikarabad, Ranga Reddy, registered for the offence punishable under Section 498-A IPC and Sections 3 and 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act at the instance of the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent/*de facto* complainant.

2. The petitioners are A.2 to A.8. A.1 is husband, A.2 is mother-in-law, A.3 is sister-in-law, A.4 is brother of A.1, A.5 is sister-in-law and A.6 to A.8 are distant relatives of A.1. On perusal of report of the *de facto* complainant, dated 03.12.2014, it is clear that the marriage of *de facto* complainant with A.1 was performed on 15.04.2012; that at the time of marriage, her parents gave cash of Rs.4,00,000/-, 10 tulas of gold besides household articles, as dowry; that the couple lived happily for about 15 days and thereafter, A.1 went to Pune to do share market business and did not come for a period of three months; that after three months, he came and demanded the *de facto* complainant to bring one lakh from her parents saying that he sustained loss in the business; that on making a phone call, the father of the *de facto* complainant brought one lakh and gave the same to A.1; that again, A.1 went to Bangalore to do business, but he did not make any phone to the *de facto* complainant; that after two months, he came and started harassing the *de facto* complainant both physically and mentally to bring additional dowry; that in this regard, the mother-in-law (A.2), sister-in-law (A.3) brother of A.1 (A.4), sister-in-law (A.5) also harassed the *de facto* complainant both physically and mentally to bring additional dowry; that on this issue, two panchayats were held, but there is no change in the attitude of A.1; that A.1 is a vagabond without any work and he used to harass the *de facto* complainant to bring additional dowry as he sustained loss in the business; that his relatives are also harassing her to bring additional dowry and hence, he prayed to take necessary action.

3. On perusal of the very F.I.R. shows, but for many allegations against husband of the *de facto* complainant, even against the mother-in-law there is a stray allegation of also harassed without mentioning on what manner and on what date and time and among the quash petitioners A.2 to A.8, she named only petitioners 1 to 3 and 5 i.e., A.2, A.3, A.4 and A.6 and not even named others. Apart from, no specific allegation or specific overt acts are attributed against the petitioners. It is suffice to say, no case is made out against the quash petitioners to continue the crime against them but for her husband is liable for the offence as per the F.I.R. averments.

4. Having regard to the above, the criminal petition is allowed quashing the proceedings in F.I.R.No.118 of 2014 of Women Police Station, Vikarabad, Ranga Reddy District, in respect of the petitioners herein/A.2 to A.8 concerned.

---

**Dr. B. SIVA SANKARA RAO, J**

**Date: .11.2015**

YVL