

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE T.SUNIL CHOWDARY

CRIMINAL PETITION No.2542 of 2015

ORDER:

This petition is filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. to quash the proceedings in C.C.No.569 of 2014 on the file of the Special Judicial First Class Magistrate for Prohibition and Excise, Guntur.

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

A perusal of the record reveals that the petitioners are accused Nos.2 and 3 and the second respondent is the *de facto* complainant.

As per the allegations made in the complaint, the petitioners herein along with accused No.1 subjected the second respondent to cruelty for additional dowry.

A perusal of the record reveals that after completion of investigation, police laid charge sheet against the petitioners herein and others under Sections 498-A IPC and 3 and 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act. The Investigating Officer has not committed any irregularity or illegality during the course of investigation. The learned Magistrate after following the procedure contemplated under Criminal Procedure Code has taken the cognizance of offence under Sections 498-A IPC and 3 and 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act against the petitioners – Accused Nos.2 and 3 and others. The material available on record *prima facie* sufficient to proceed further against the petitioners. However, if this Court expresses any opinion at this point of time, the same may cause prejudice to either of the parties.

In **Madhu Limaye Vs. State of Maharashtra** the Hon'ble Supreme Court held as under:

“At the outset the following principles may be noticed in relation to the exercise of inherent power of the High Court, which have been followed ordinarily and generally, almost invariably, barring a few exceptions.

1. That the power is not to be resorted to if there is a specific provision in the Code for the redress of the grievance of the aggrieved party;
2. That it should be exercised very sparingly to prevent abuse of process of any Court or otherwise to secure the ends of justice;
3. That it should not be exercised as against the express bar of law engrafted in any other provision of the Code.”

In **Padal Venkata Rama Reddy @ Ramu Vs. Kovvuri Satyanarayana Reddy**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held as under:

13. It is well settled that the inherent powers under Section 482 can be exercised only when no other remedy is available to the litigant and not in a situation where a specific remedy is provided by the statute. It cannot be used if it is inconsistent with specific provisions provided under the Code (vide *Kavita v. State* {2000 Cri LJ 315 (Del)} and *B.S. Joshi v. State of Haryana* {(2003) 4 SCC 675}. If an effective alternative remedy is available, the High Court will not exercise its powers under this section, specially when the applicant may not have availed of that remedy.

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 at this point of time.

The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are facing much difficulty to attend the trial Court on each and every date of adjournment. Hence, their presence may be dispensed with.

There is no dispute with regard to the identity of the petitioners. Even if the presence of the petitioners is dispensed with, no prejudice would be caused to the second respondent-complainant.

Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, the presence of petitioners, who are accused Nos.2 and 3 in C.C.No.569 of 2014 on the file of the Special Judicial First Class Magistrate for Prohibition & Excise, Guntur, is dispensed with on each and every date of adjournment. However, they shall appear before the trial Court as and when their presence is so required.

With the above observation, the Criminal Petition is dismissed.

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

T.SUNIL CHOWDARY, J

Date:06.04.2015

Rns