

we3 IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 11.04.2018

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE T.RAJA

W.P.No.8446 of 2018

Mrs.V.Revathi

.. Petitioner

-vs-

1.The Protection Officer
District Social Wefare office
43, II Street, Gandhi Nagar
Near Indian Overseas Bank
Kancheepuram -631 502

2.Mr.B.Ganesh

3.K.Baskaran

4.B.Bhuvaneswari

5.R.Varalakshmi

6.Ramalingam

.. Respondents

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issue of a Writ of Mandamus, directing the 1st respondent to consider the Domestic Violence Petition filed by the petitioner dated 27.02.2017 in proceedings letter No.DVA/304/A5/2017 dated 13.03.2017.

For Petitioner :: Mr.M.Vivekanandan

For Respondent :: Ms.S.Ramya Revathy
Government Advocate for R1

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed by Mrs.V.Revathi, seeking writ of mandamus directing the first respondent to consider the petition dated 27.02.2017.

2.Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner in support of the prayer submitted that when the petitioner married the second respondent Mr.B.Ganesh on 12.02.2016, as per the Hindu rights and rituals at PMM Thirumana Arangam, Mannargudi on the basis of

the advertisement given in Chennai Sai Sankara Matrimonial website, 33 sovereigns of gold and 2.5 kgs of silver were given and marriage expenses, over all amounting to Rs.12,00,000/- was spent by the parents of the petitioner. Even prior to the marriage, the engagement ceremony was also held on 31.08.2015 at Akshaya Mahal, Nanganallur. Only thereafter, the marriage took place on 12.02.2016 at Mannargudi. The entire transportation charges during marriage from 10.02.2016 to 13.02.2016 for about 250 members who are relatives, friends and family members of the second respondent were meted out by the petitioner's parents. All of a sudden, after the marriage, the second respondent's parents started behaving indifferently and frequently picked up quarrels with the petitioner and her family members. It is further stated that when the petitioner and the second respondent were staying separately at Villupuram, the second respondent's mother and his unmarried sister stayed along with them and thereupon, the petitioner's privacy has been spoiled. Their continuous stay with the petitioner for about 20 days has created mental harassment.

3. This Court is unable to find any justification in making such a wild allegation. It is natural for the petitioner's husband's family members to visit or stay with them for 10 or 20 days. That is not an issue. That cannot be said to be harassment meted out to the petitioner. This Court, finding no serious allegation made out for issuing any direction, is not inclined to entertain this writ petition. This Court is also wish to make it clear that the writ petition is filed with frivolous and false allegations only to harass the second respondent and his family members. Therefore, the writ petition has to be dismissed.

Accordingly, this writ petition is dismissed. However, this Court is not imposing any cost for wasting precious and valuable time of the Court.

Sd/-

Asst.Registrar (CS IX)

/true copy/

Sub Asst. Registrar

gpa

To


1.The Protection Officer
District Social Wefare office
43, II Street, Gandhi Nagar
Near Indian Overseas Bank
Kancheepuram -631 502

+ 1 cc to Mr.M.Vivekanandan Advocate,SR.26557

+ 1 cc to The Govt.Pleader, SR.27702

W.P.No.8446 of 2018

sr(co)
nr 27/04/2018



WEB COPY