



CRL OP(MD). No.4115 of 2024

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

Dated : 07.11.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

**CRL OP(MD). No.4115 of 2024
and
CrI.MP(MD)Nos.3242 & 3243 of 2024**

1. Bhuvaneswari,
2. Selvi,
3. Shanthi, ... Petitioners

Vs.

1. The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Thallakulm, Madurai District.
Crime No.37 of 2023.

2. Ramadevi, ... Respondents

PRAYER :- This Petition is filed under Section 528 BNSS, to call for records pertaining to the Charge Sheet in C.C.No.254 of 2024 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate, Additional Mahila Court, Madurai in so far as the petitioners concerned and quash the same as illegal.

For Petitioners : Mr.T.Leninkumar,

For Respondents : Mr.R.Meenakshi Sundaram,
Additional Public Prosecutor for R1

: No appearance for R2



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No.4115 of 2024

ORDER

This Petition is filed to quash the impugned final report filed for the offences under Sections 498(A), 406, 342, 506(i) I.P.C.

2. The petitioners are the mother-in-law and sisters-in-law (A2 to A4) of the defacto complainant. The gist of the allegation in the impugned final report is that the first accused, who is the son of the first petitioner herein, got married to the defacto complainant 27 years prior to the filing of the F.I.R; that though they had matrimonial differences, they are living in the same house; that on 13.06.2023, since the first accused did not pay proper maintenance to the defacto complainant, the defacto complainant lodged a complaint before the Tallakulam Police Station, where he promised to pay Rs.10,000/- as maintenance; that thereafter, he failed to pay; that on 13.06.2023, the first accused abused the defacto complainant and the daughters in filthy language; that on 22.06.2023, when the defacto complainant attempted to enter the house, where the first accused was living, the first accused had detained their daughter illegally and made her wait outside the house; and thus,

2/6



CRL OP(MD). No.4115 of 2024

committed the aforesaid offences. It is further alleged that the petitioners had retained the jewels and the petitioners also involved in the aforesaid offences.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners are living separately; that the allegation that the petitioner retained the jewels after 27 years of the marriage is highly improbable; that the allegations against the petitioners are very vague and that in any case, the allegation of detention of the defacto complainant's daughter is made against the first accused and the petitioners 2 and 3, who are married sisters of the first accused and are living separately have been roped in only to wreak vengeance.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor would reiterate the averments made in the final report. He would also state that the first respondent has collected materials to establish the involvement of the petitioners as well as the first accused and therefore, the impugned prosecution may not be quashed.



CRL OP(MD). No.4115 of 2024

WEB COPY

5. Though notice has been served on the second respondent, none has entered appearance.

6. A reading of the impugned final report would suggest that the petitioners have nothing to do with the matrimonial affairs of the first accused and the defacto complainant. The first accused and the defacto complainant got married 27 years ago. The alleged occurrence is said to have taken place on 22.06.2023, in which there is no allegation as against the petitioners. As regards the petitioners, the only allegation is that they had retained the jewels of the defacto complainant, which is highly improbable and it is an afterthought. Admittedly, the petitioners are not living in the matrimonial home. The petitioners 2 and 3 are sisters of the first accused, married and are living independently. Hence, the allegation of cruelty and dowry demand and criminal breach of trust besides being vague, is attended with malafides, as against the petitioners. Hence, the impugned prosecution as against the petitioners is liable to be quashed.



CRL OP(MD). No.4115 of 2024

WEB COPY

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is allowed and the impugned prosecution is hereby quashed. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petitions are closed.

07.11.2025

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes/ No
LS/ars

TO

1. The Judicial Magistrate,
Additional Mahila Court,
Madurai.

2.The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Thallakulm,
Madurai District.

3. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No.4115 of 2024

SUNDER MOHAN,J

LS/ars

CRL OP(MD) No.4115 of 2024

07.11.2025