

IN THE COURT OF SUBORDINATE JUDGE, PANRUTI

Present: Mrs. Anitha Anand, M.B.A., L.L.M.

Subordinate Judge, Panruti

Tuesday, the 25th day of August, 2026



HMOP. No. 32/2025

(CNR. No. TNCD070003042025)

Harineeshwari

... Petitioner

Vs.

Ajithkumar

... Respondent

Petition finally heard 21.08.2026 and upon perusal of records of the case and evidence, and on hearing submissions, this court passes the following order:

Appearance:

For the Petitioner: Mr. M.Ranjithkumar, B.B.A., L.L.B.(Hons)., M.Rajkumar, B.A., L.L.B.(Hons).,

For the Respondent: Mr. R. Kannappan, B.A. B.L.,

O R D E R

Petition under Section 13(1)(i-a) of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, for dissolution of the marriage between the petitioner and the respondent, solemnized on 06.02.2022 at K.V.K. Thirumana Mahal, Muthunarayapuram, Panruti Taluk, and for costs.

2. Gist of the Averments of the Petitioner

2.1. The petitioner is the wife of the respondent. Their marriage was solemnized on 06.02.2022 at K.V.K. Thirumana Mahal, Muthunarayapuram, Panruti Taluk, as per Hindu rites and customs. At the time of marriage, the respondent demanded dowry, and the petitioner's parents gave 23 sovereigns of gold jewellery, a cot, a refrigerator, household articles and a two-wheeler as dowry, worth Rs.3,00,000/-. After the marriage, the petitioner and the respondent lived together in the respondent's house. The dowry given by the petitioner's parents was not sufficient, and the respondent demanded an additional 25 sovereigns of gold jewellery and a car as dowry. The respondent and his family compelled the petitioner to obtain the additional dowry from her parents.

2.2. The petitioner lived in the respondent's house for only three months after the marriage. When the petitioner reminded the respondent that he had promised to allow her to continue her studies, the respondent became angry

and refused to allow her to study. Despite this, the petitioner continued to live in the respondent's house. The respondent scolded the petitioner in filth language, for using electricity and even to stand outside. The petitioner states that the respondent scolded and abused her every day. Therefore, the petitioner went to her parents' house at Cuddalore. Thereafter, the respondent came to the petitioner's parents' house and stated that he could not live without the petitioner. The petitioner's father purchased a house at Koothapakkam, Cuddalore, paid the advance amount and arranged for the petitioner and the respondent to live separately. The petitioner's father also secured a job for the respondent through his acquaintance. However, the respondent worked there for only one month and paid the rent for the house for only one month. Thereafter, the respondent went to his parents' house and left the petitioner alone and did not return. The respondent and his parents continued to demand additional dowry, and the respondent had no intention of living with the petitioner.

2.3. The petitioner's parents were leading a difficult life and had already incurred substantial loans for the marriage. Therefore, they were not in a position to provide the additional dowry demanded by the respondent. The respondent and his parents frequently demanded additional dowry, spoke disparagingly about the petitioner and her family, and subjected her to cruelty.

The respondent abused the petitioner in obscene language and beat her with his hands in the presence of several persons.

2.4. The petitioner suffered physical and mental pain due to the acts of the respondent. Further, the respondent would often return home in a drunken condition and abuse the petitioner in filthy language. The respondent demanded additional dowry from the petitioner's parents. Therefore, the petitioner was left with no other option but to go to her mother's house, where she has been residing. The petitioner has suffered severe mental and physical cruelty due to the conduct of the respondent. Whiles, the respondent issued a legal notice with false allegations against the petitioner on 7.2.2025 to which the petitioner issued a reply dated 16.2.2025 to the respondent and his counsel. Then, the petitioner has filed the present petition seeking dissolution of the marriage on the ground of cruelty.

3. Gist of the Averments of the Respondent

3.1. The respondent denies that, at the time of marriage, the petitioner's parents gave 23 sovereigns of gold jewellery, a two-wheeler and household appliances worth Rs.3,00,000/- to the respondent as dowry. The respondent also states that the petitioner's claim that the respondent and his parents promised to allow her to pursue further studies after marriage is completely untrue.

3.2. The respondent denies that he and his parents together demanded 25 sovereigns of gold jewellery from the petitioner and that, when she refused to comply with the demand, they beat and tortured her and drove her out of the house. The respondent states that a panchayat was held in this regard and that the allegations made by the petitioner are false and concocted. The respondent further states that the petitioner incited him to commit suicide and that the petitioner recorded a video of the incident. The respondent states that the allegations made by the petitioner are fictional and false. In fact, the petitioner's brother took all the gold jewellery that the petitioner had given to the respondent as dowry. When the petitioner asked her brother to return the jewellery, stating that she was going to live with the respondent, the respondent alleges that the petitioner did not tolerate the same and repeatedly physically attacked him.

3.3. As stated by the petitioner in the petition, the petitioner's father had arranged a separate house for both of them in Cuddalore and had allowed them to reside there. The petitioner's father had also secured a job for the respondent. However, the respondent did not continue in the said employment and left the petitioner alone and went to his parents' house. The respondent states that his parents were interested only in demanding additional dowry. The respondent specifically and categorically denies that he had no intention

of living with the petitioner.

3.4. In fact, the petitioner does not menstruate every month and menstruates only once in six months. For this reason, the respondent took the petitioner to the hospital at his own expense and arranged for her treatment. The petitioner had openly told the respondent several times that she was not in a position to have a child. The respondent consoled the petitioner in this regard. Despite the respondent's instructions, the petitioner deliberately went to important functions without wearing any gold jewellery. Due to this, the respondent states that he was insulted by society on several occasions. The petitioner, without the knowledge of the respondent, had given the gold jewellery to her relatives and family members and had not received the same back till date.

3.5. Further, the petitioner sent a legal notice to the respondent through her lawyer on 07.02.2025. The respondent received the same and sent a reply through his lawyer on 16.02.2025. The respondent states that the petitioner is seeking divorce from him and that the other allegations contained in the petition are false, fabricated and concocted for the purpose of filing the present original petition. Hence, the petition is liable to be dismissed.

4. Points for Determination

- 1. Whether the petitioner has proved the ground of cruelty for dissolution*

of the marriage?

2. *Whether the petitioner is entitled to the relief of dissolution of marriage?*

5. Heard Both Sides

6. Evidence on the Side of the Petitioner

On the side of the petitioner, the petitioner examined herself as PW1 and marked Exhibits P1 to P6. Ex.P1 is the original marriage invitation for the wedding dated 06.02.2022. Ex.P2 is the office copy of the legal notice dated 07.02.2025 issued by the respondent to the petitioner. Ex.P3 is the office copy of the reply notice dated 16.02.2025 along with the postal receipt issued by the petitioner to the respondent. Ex.P4 and Ex.P5 are the acknowledgment cards evidencing the receipt of the notice by the respondent and his counsel. Ex.P6 is the xerox copy of the Aadhaar Card of the petitioner.

7. Evidence on the Side of the Respondent

On the side of the respondent, the respondent examined himself as RW1 and no document was marked.

8. Findings on the Points

8.1. The petitioner, in her proof affidavit, stated that the petitioner was not interested in the marriage, physically assaulted her and drove her out of the matrimonial home. During her cross-examination, she stated that the articles

belonging to either side were returned and she would not claim maintenance in future.

8.2. The respondent, in his proof affidavit, has reiterated the averments made in the petition. During his cross-examination, he stated that he and the respondent have been living separately. He further deposed that both of them have decided to dissolve the marriage. They have no children through the wedlock. He also stated that all the *Sridhana* articles have been exchanged and returned to the respective parties and that no other proceedings are pending between them. It is also observed from the terms of settlement enclosed with the mediation report that the parties decided to part their way before the mediators.

8.3. From the evidence of both parties, it is clear that they have been living separately and there is no possibility of their resuming matrimonial life. Both parties have settled their claims with regard to the *Sridhana* articles. They have no children through the marriage. The Petitioner has categorically stated that she is not claiming maintenance and has no objection for dissolution of the marriage. The respondent also consented for dissolution of the marriage. Though both the parties raised allegations and counter allegations against each other and they did not stick on to the same during the respective cross examination. The conduct of the parties clearly establishes that the

matrimonial relationship has completely broken down and that all efforts for reunion have failed.

8.4. In the circumstances, compelling the parties to continue their marital life would cause further mental agony to both of them. Denial of consummation of the marriage amounts to mental cruelty on the part of the spouse. This Court is satisfied that the petitioner has established sufficient grounds for dissolution of the marriage. Accordingly, it is held that the petitioner has proved the ground for dissolution of the marriage. Therefore, the petitioner is entitled to the relief of dissolution of marriage.

9. Result

In the result, the petition is allowed. The marriage solemnized between the petitioner and the respondent on 06.02.2022 at K.V.K. Thirumana Mahal, Muthunarayapuram, Panruti Taluk is hereby dissolved by a decree of divorce under Section 13(1)(i-a) of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955.

In the circumstances of the case, there shall be no order as to costs.

Computerized by the Steno-typist directly on my dictation. Corrected and pronounced by me in the open court, this the 25th day of August, 2026.

Subordinate Judge
Panruti.

Petitioner Side Witness

PW1 – Harineeshwari - Petitioner

Petitioner Side Exhibits

Ex.P1	Original marriage invitation
Ex.P2	Office copy of the Legal notice
Ex.P3	Office copy of the Legal notice with postal receipt
Ex.P4	Served Acknowledgment card
Ex.P5	Served Acknowledgment card
Ex.P6	Xerox copy of Aadhar card of the petitioner

Respondent Side Witness

RW1 – Ajithkumar - Respondent

Respondent Side Exhibits : NIL

**Subordinate Judge
Panruti.**

Panruti.Fair Order
(AFT)

O.S. No. 32/2025

Date: 25.08.2026