

THE HON'BLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE RAMESH RANGANATHAN

AND

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A.SHANKAR NARAYANA

WRIT APPEAL NO.1049 OF 2016

JUDGMENT: {Per the Hon'ble the Acting Chief Justice Ramesh Ranganathan}

This appeal, under Clause 15 of the Letters Patent Act, is preferred against the order passed by the learned Single Judge dismissing the Writ Petition on the ground that the appellant-writ petitioner lacked *locus standi* to file the Writ Petition.

The petitioner is the son-in-law of the eighth respondent. The petitioner's wife (daughter of the eighth respondent) is said to have lodged a complaint against the petitioner for offences, among others, under the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 ("the Act" for brevity). The statement of the eighth respondent was recorded as L.W.2 by the investigating officer wherein he is said to have stated that he had paid dowry to the appellant. Contending that payment of dowry is also an offence under the Act, the petitioner filed a complaint to the State Bank of Hyderabad requesting them to initiate disciplinary action against the eighth respondent for having paid dowry.

As the petitioner is alleged to be the recipient of the dowry, we asked Sri P.Nagendra Reddy, learned counsel appearing on his behalf, whether the petitioner admitted receipt of dowry, for only then can the eighth respondent be proceeded against for having paid dowry. Learned counsel would deny the allegation that the petitioner had received dowry. If the petitioner claims not to have received dowry, the necessary corollary thereto is that, even according to him, the eighth respondent could not have paid

dowry, in which event the complaint made by the petitioner to the State Bank of Hyderabad, to initiate disciplinary action against the eighth respondent, could not have been acted upon.

The learned Single Judge has rightly rejected the Writ Petition, and refused to grant relief to the petitioner on the ground that he lacked *locus standi* to file the Writ Petition. While we see no reason to interfere with the order of the learned single Judge dismissing the Writ Petition, we make it clear that we have not expressed any opinion on whether or not the eighth respondent had paid dowry to the appellant, or whether the appellant had received dowry from him.

The Writ Appeal fails and is, accordingly, dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs. Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending shall stand dismissed.



(RAMESH RANGANATHAN, ACJ)

(A.SHANKAR NARAYANA, J)

21st October 2016
RRB