

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A.RAMALINGESWARA RAO**

**WRIT PETITION No.9625 of 2017**

**ORDER:**

Heard the learned Counsel for the petitioners and the learned Government Pleader.

It is the case of the petitioners that the third respondent married the son of the first petitioner on 15.04.2016 as per Muslim rites and customs at Champapet, Hyderabad. Thereafter, the husband of the third respondent went to USA for job purpose. However, he could not take his wife even though he made efforts to take his wife. In the meanwhile, the father-in-law of the third respondent expired. The third respondent did not live in her mother-in-law's house and went to her parents' house. It is the further case of the petitioners that on the apprehension that the husband may not take her to USA, the third respondent gave a false complaint to the Police which was registered as Crime No.135 of 2017 on 14.03.2017. Challenging the said registration of crime, the present Writ Petition is filed.

Learned Counsel for the petitioners submits that the second respondent should not have straightaway registered the crime in a case relating to matrimonial dispute and they should have counseled the parties and should have waited for some time before registration of the crime.

The petitioners did not file a copy of the complaint in order to appreciate the reasons for lodging the complaint, and this Court cannot interfere with the registration of crime, which was done on 14.03.2017. There is no material to show that the Police will not follow due process of law pursuant to registration of crime.

In the circumstances, this Court is not inclined to entertain the present Writ Petition, but disposes of the Writ Petition with a direction to the second respondent to follow due process of law pursuant to registration of the crime. The miscellaneous petitions pending in this Writ Petition, if any, shall stand closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

17.03.2017  
vs

**(A.RAMALINGESWARA RAO, J)**

