

-

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE T.SUNIL CHOWDARY

CRIMINAL PETITION No.908 of 2016

ORDER:

This petition is filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. to quash the proceedings against the petitioners/A.2 to A.4 in Crime No.1 of 2016 on the file of the Station House Officer, Women Police Station, Tirupathi, Tirupathi Urban, registered for the offences under Sections 498-A and 420 I.P.C. and Sections 3 and 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961.

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

3. A perusal of the record reveals that the petitioners are accused Nos.2 to 4 and the first respondent is the *de facto* complainant in Crime No.1 of 2016. It further reveals that the marriage of the first respondent was performed with accused No.1 on 06.02.2015 at Tirumala as per Hindu Rites and Caste Custom.

4. As per the allegations made in the complaint, the parents of the first respondent gave Rs.1.52 crores to accused No.1 on different dates. It is further alleged that the petitioners along with accused No.1 have subjected the first respondent to cruelty. It is also alleged that the petitioners have cheated the first respondent.

5. Whether the petitioners have committed the alleged offences or not will come to light during the course of investigation. While exercising the inherent power under Section 482 Cr.P.C., the Court has to take into consideration the allegations made in the complaint only. The Court is not justified in embarking upon an enquiry as to

probability, reliability or genuineness of the allegations made in the complaint at the initial stage of investigation. The material placed before the Court is *prima facie* sufficient to investigate into the matter in order to ascertain the truthfulness or otherwise of the allegations made in the complaint.

6. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case and also the principle enunciated in **R.P.Kapoor v. State of Punjab**^[1], **State of Haryana v. Bhajan Lal**^[2], **V.Y.Jose v. State of Gurajat**^[3] and **Teeja Devi v. State of Rajasthan**^[4], I am of the considered view that this is not a fit case to quash the criminal proceedings at the threshold.

7. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the concerned Station House Officer may be directed not to arrest the petitioners till completion of the investigation.

8. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is inclined to direct the Station House Officer, Women Police Station, Tirupathi, Tirupathi Urban, not to arrest the petitioners/A.2 to A.4 in Crime No.1 of 2016 till completion of the investigation.

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

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

-

T.SUNIL CHOWDARY, J

-

Date: 04.02.2016

lvd

[\[1\]](#) AIR 1960 SC 866

[\[2\]](#) AIR 1992 SC 604

[\[3\]](#) (2009) 3 SCC 78

[\[4\]](#) 2015 (1) ACR 564 (SC)