

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE T.SUNIL CHOWDARY**

**CRIMINAL PETITION No.12382 of 2015**

**ORDER:**

This petition is filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. to quash the proceedings against the petitioners/respondent Nos.2 to 5 in D.V.C. No.43 of 2014 on the file of the court of Judicial Magistrate of First Class (Special Mobile Magistrate), Anantapur.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners and learned Public Prosecutor representing the State.

3. A perusal of the record reveals that the second respondent filed the complaint under Section 12 of the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005 (for short, the Act) claiming the reliefs under Sections 18 to 22 of the Act against the petitioners and another. On receipt of the complaint, the learned Magistrate has taken the case on file and numbered it as D.V.C. No.43 of 2014 and issued summons to the petitioners.

4. This Court can quash the proceedings under Section 482 Cr.P.C. in the following circumstances: (1) if the allegations made in the complaint do not constitute any cause of action, or (2) even if the allegations made in the complaint ex facie are taken to be true and correct, there is no possibility to grant reliefs against the petitioners, or (3) the continuation of the proceedings in DVC would amount to abuse of the process of the Court.

5. A perusal of the record reveals that the marriage of second respondent was performed with K.Bala Gangaiah (first respondent in D.V.C.) on 23.5.2013 at Sri Balaji Temple, Anantapur, as per Hindu rites and caste customs. The petitioners are mother, brothers and sister of Bala Gangaiah. In the complaint, it is alleged that the petitioners and others harassed the second respondent to get

additional dowry from her mother.

6. As per the principle enunciated in **Valisetti Chandra Rekha v. State of Andhra Pradesh**<sup>[1]</sup>, **Mohit Yadam v. State of Andhra Pradesh**<sup>[2]</sup>, **Mohd. Akber Yaseen v. Rizwana Sultana**<sup>[3]</sup> and **Mangesh Sawant v Minal Vijay Bhosale**<sup>[4]</sup>, the reliefs sought under Sections 18 to 23 of DV Act are civil in nature and there is no element of criminality therein. Therefore, the maintainability of present petition is very much doubtful. A perusal of the complaint *prima facie* reveals the role played by the petitioners herein.

7. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case and also the principle enunciated in the cases cited supra, I am of the view that it is not a fit case to quash the proceedings against the petitioners/respondent Nos.2 to 5 in DVC No.43 of 2014.

8. Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted to dispense with the presence of the petitioners before the trial court on each and every date of adjournment. There is no dispute with regard to the identity of the petitioners. Even if the presence of the petitioners is dispensed with, no prejudice will be caused to the second respondent. Hence, this court is inclined to dispense with the presence of the petitioners/respondent Nos.2 to 5 before the trial court.

9. With the above observations, the Criminal Petition is dismissed. The presence of the petitioners/respondent Nos.2 to 5 in DVC No.43 of 2014 before the trial court on each and every date of adjournment is dispensed with. However, they shall appear before the trial court as and when their presence is so required. Miscellaneous petitions if any pending in this criminal petition shall stand closed.

---

**T.SUNIL CHOWDARY, J**

November 25, 2015.

YS

---

[\[1\]](#) 2010 (2) ALD (Cri.) 689 (AP)

[\[2\]](#) 2010 (1) ALD (Cri.) 1 (AP)

[\[3\]](#) 2010 (2) ALD (Cri.) 680 (AP)

[\[4\]](#) 2012 Cri.L.J. 1413 (Bombay)