

THE HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE B.SIVA SANKARA RAO

CRIMINAL PETITION No.7437 OF 2013

ORDER:

This criminal petition is filed by the petitioners/respondent Nos.1 to 6 under Section 482 Cr.P.C seeking to quash the proceedings in D.V.C. No.2 of 2012 on the file of the Judicial First Class Magistrate, at Sathupally, Khammam District.

2. Heard the learned counsel for petitioners and perused the material on record.

3. The contention of the learned counsel for the petitioners that the subject matter already covered by the expression of this Court in **Gaddameedi Nagamani v. State of Telengana**¹. Undisputedly, the scope of Section 29 of the Domestic Violence Act is not referred in earlier expressions of the Apex Court, even much less came for consideration but for the general observation saying the refusal to entertain the quash saying not connected with offence in the domestic violence is not sustainable (It is because the procedure is almost akin to Section 125 of Cr.P.C. and quasi criminal in nature). It is needless to say the remedy is to file an appeal against the order in D.V.C as per Section 29 of the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act as an efficacious remedy is any order includes taken on file by the learned Magistrate by application of mind. In fact, the Apex Court in **State of Haryana v. Bhajan Lal**² laid down the seven guidelines which include showing of no other alternative or efficacious remedy as per clause (f) of (a to g) to maintain the quash proceedings. Here, once there is an efficacious appeal remedy provided undisputedly even to impugn the taking of cognizance (taken on file) of the matter for the relief sought,

¹ 2015(3) ALT (CrL.) 263

² AIR 1992 SC 604

such order to impugn before Court of Sessions, this Court is not inclined to stretch its hand to admit for quash the proceedings.

4. In the result, the Criminal Petition is disposed of giving liberty to the petitioners to move the trial Court to dispense with their personal presence of all petitioners but for one by invoking Rule 37 of Criminal Rules of Practice or Section 205 Cr.P.C or Section 126(2) Cr.P.C if not dispensed with under Section 126(2) Cr.P.C of their presence to record the evidence in the presence of their advocate and in such an event, the learned Magistrate after hearing shall consider and allow the same with necessary conditions. Needless to say as the petitioners instead of filing an appeal before the Sessions Judge approached this Court, the petitioners can file a petition before the appellate Court concerned to condone the delay caused by deducting the period from the date of filing this petition till today.

Miscellaneous petitions pending, if any, in the criminal petition shall stand closed.

DR.B.SIVA SANKARA RAO, J

Date: 14th February, 2019

KL

THE HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE B.SIVA SANKARA RAO



CRIMINAL PETITION No.7437 OF 2013

Date: 14th February, 2019

KL