



WEB COPY



CrI.O.P.No.17853 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 30.08.2024

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE DR.JUSTICE **G.JAYACHANDRAN**

CrI.O.P.No.17853 of 2024

and

CrI.M.P.Nos.10603 & 10604 of 2024

1.Balachandar  
2.Sundar  
3.Sathya Kumari  
4.Aravindha Kumar S

... Petitioners

Vs.

The State Rep.by  
The Inspector of Police,  
All Women Police Station, Adyar  
Dr.Muthu Lakshmi Road, Indira Nagar,  
Adyar, Chennai, Tamil Nadu-600 020.

2.Purusothaman

... Respondents

**Prayer:** Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C.,  
pleaded to call for the records and quash the charge sheet in C.C.No.1032  
of 2022, pending on the file of the learned IX Metropolitan Magistrate,  
Saidapet.

For Petitioners : Mr.Rahul JAgannathan

For R1 : Mr.S.Udayakumar  
Government Advocate (CrI.Side)

**ORDER**



CrI.O.P.No.17853 of 2024

WEB COPY

On a complaint given by Mr.Purusothaman, the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent police has registered a case in Crime No.13 of 2020 and on completion of investigation, final report filed and taken on file by IX Metropolitan Magistrate, Saidapet in C.C.No.1032 of 2022. Accused persons are his daughter's husband, father-in-law, mother-in-law and brother-in-law.

2. The petition to quash is filed on four grounds (i) on the date of registering the complaint, there was no relationship of husband and wife between the 1<sup>st</sup> accused and the daughter of the complainant (2) the complainant has not obtained any authority or authorization to give complaint on behalf of his daughter (3) to attract offence under Section 352 IPC, there must be injury and document to support the injury. As far as this case is concerned, there is no wound certificate to substantiate and frame a charge for offence under Section 352 IPC (4) there is no evidence to show that 130 sovereigns of jewels has given as stridhana or in possession of A2 to A4. Even otherwise as per the latest judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, Stridhana property given during the time of marriage cannot be revert back to the parents of the bride and therefore, the complainant cannot have any right or claim over the Stridhana



CrI.O.P.No.17853 of 2024

property to charge A2 to A4 for offence under Section 406 IPC.

WEB COPY

3. The learned counsel appearing for the defacto complainant submits that the complaint regarding cruelty, breach of trust and other marital crime was reported to the parents much before the grant of divorce. Since, at that point of time, the 1<sup>st</sup> accused was residing in Australia, police initially did not register the complaint and therefore, the petitioner filed application before the Metropolitan Magistrate under Section 156(3) Cr.P.C., and pursuant to the order passed by the IX Metropolitan Magistrate, Saidapet in CrI.M.P.No.7965 of 2020 dated 27.02.2020, the complaint was registered by the respondent police and thereafter, completed the investigation and filed final report and also submits that the Investigating Officer has recorded the statement of his daughter who is the victim of the crime and she has explained how she was subjected to cruelty and how jewels given to her been taken away by the accused persons. The subsequent event such as consent divorce granted by the Australian Court to be confined only for the marital relationship and that could not erase away all the cruelty and crime committed during the existence of the marriage. The learned counsel appearing for the defacto complainant/respondent further submits that



CrI.O.P.No.17853 of 2024

since the daughter of the complainant had gone to Australia for her avocation and livelihood, complaint been pursued by the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent.

4. This Court, on perusing the record and hearings the submissions made by the counsels, is of the firm view that in the matrimonial dispute, Court cannot take a decision in all cases applying the view expressed by higher Courts without testing the facts which may differ, case to case. Here is a case where it is alleged that the marriage took place in the year 2016, the spouse have gone to Australia in the year 2018, a child was born through the wedlock in the year 2019 and thereafter, discord development which has resulted in lodging the complaint through Metropolitan Magistrate in the month of February 2020. No doubt, the Australian Court has granted dissolution of marriage vide order dated 09.06.2020. The consent divorce granted cannot be taken as an order to exonerate the crimes committed in India, which are cognizable and triable. The subsequent dissolution of marriage in any case cannot take away the criminality committed unless and until, the victim who is the sufferer of the crime condone the act of crime on the face of records. The investigation which has led to filing of final report indicates that Mourisha, the daughter of the defacto complainant had



CrI.O.P.No.17853 of 2024

subjected to cruelty by her husband and relatives of her husband, when the marriage was in subsistence.

5. The prosecution has laid for the act committed when the marriage was subsistence and therefore the case cannot be quashed, when the material relied by the prosecution apparently disclose the commission of cognizable offence.

6. The learned counsel appearing for the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent submits that the prime victim of the crime is Mourisha and the collateral damage suffered by her father, the defacto complainant. The daughter of the complainant will be coming down to India soon and ready to even substitute herself in the place of her father and pursue the prosecution.

7. In the light of the above facts and circumstances, this Court is of the view that it is not a case to quash, since the commission of cognizable offence been made out to the evidence collected in the course of investigation. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed. Consequently, the connected Criminal Miscellaneous Petitions are closed. The observation made in this Criminal Original Petition is



CrI.O.P.No.17853 of 2024

confined to decide the quash petition and no other purpose.

WEB COPY

**30.08.2024**

Neutral Citation : Yes/No  
rpl

To

1.The IX Metropolitan Magistrate, Saidapet, Chennai.

2.The Inspector of Police,  
All Women Police Station, Adyar  
Dr.Muthu Lakshmi Road, Indira Nagar,  
Adyar, Chennai, Tamil Nadu-600 020.

3.The Public Prosecutor,  
High Court of Madras,  
Chennai.

**Dr.G.JAYACHANDRAN,J.**

rpl



WEB COPY



CrI.O.P.No.17853 of 2024

CrI.O.P.No.17853 of 2024

30.08.2024