

TNTS080005362024



**IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL DISTRICT MUNSIF / JUDICIAL
MAGISTRATE, SANKARANKOVIL**

Present: Selvi. Pavithra G, LL.M.,

Additional District Munsif / Judicial Magistrate,

Sankarankovil

Dated Thursday, the 04th day of June 2026

Calendar Case No.209/2024

CNR No.TNTS08 – 000536 - 2024

The State represented by

The Sub-Inspector of Police,

All Woman Police Station (Cr.No.47/2013)

... Complainant

//Vs//

1. Karuppasamy, (aged 27/2014)

S/o. Gurusamy,

Water Tank Street, Mankudi

2. Gurusamy, (died) (aged 54/2014)

S/o. Ramaiah Nadar,

Water Tank Street, Mankudi

3. Backiyalakshmi, (aged 50/2014)

W/o. Gurusamy,

Water Tank Street, Mankudi

... A1 to A3

1.	Case Number	CC No.209/2024
2.	Name of the Police Station and Crime Number	All women Police station Crime No.47/2013
3.	Name of the Accused	A1 – Karuppasamy A2 – Gurusamy (died) A3 - Backiyalakshmi
4.	Date of Occurrence	2009 year
5.	Date of Complaint	14.05.2013
6.	Date of Arrest	A2 – 16.05.2013 A3 – 30.05.2013
7.	Period of remand	A2 – 16.05.2013 to 29.05.2013 A3 – 30.05.2013 to 05.06.2013
8.	Date of release on bail	A1 – 18.08.2014 (Anticipatory bail)

		A2 – 29.05.2013 (Condition bail) A3 – 05.06.2013 Condition bail)	
9.	Date of filing final report	19.12.2014	
10.	Date of Commencement of trial	16.03.2015	
11.	Date of Chief examination	PW1	14.08.2025
		PW2	24.10.2025
		PW3	24.10.2025
		PW4	30.10.2025
		PW5	12.02.2026
		PW6	02.04.2026
		PW7	30.04.2026
12.	Date of Cross examination	PW1	14.08.2025
		PW2	24.10.2025
		PW3	24.10.2025
		PW4	30.10.2025
		PW5	12.02.2026
		PW6	02.04.2026
		PW7	30.04.2026

13.	Date of Conclusion of trial	19.05.2026
14.	Plea of the accused	Not guilty
15.	Finding of the Court	The accused A2 – Gurusamy had died on 10.09.2024 (i.e.) during pendency of the trial. Hence, charges framed /s. 498(A), 294(b), 406, 506(2) of IPC and 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act stand abated as against him. Accused A1 and A3 are found not guilty for the offences u/s. 498A, 294(b), 406, 506(2) of IPC and S. 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act and are acquitted u/s. 248(1) of Cr.P.C.

This case came up for a final hearing on 26.05.2026 in the presence of Thiru.Salaman Jaccob, Assistant Public Prosecutor Gr.I representing the State, and Advocate Thiru.M.Ananth, representing the A1 and Advocate Thiru.T.Gandhikumar, representing the A3 and A2 died. After hearing both side arguments and perusing the documents and having stood over for consideration till this day, this Court pronounced the following:

JUDGMENT

1. The Sub-Inspector of Police, All Women Police Station had filed a final report alleging that on 24.02.2006, marriage happened between LW1 – Kavitha and A1 - Karuppasamy; that the marriage happened in the presence of village elders;

that during marriage, 16 sovereigns of gold jewels was given to LW1 and Rs. 70,000/- cash was given to A1's family members; that in 2009, A1 to A3 asked LW1 to pay Rs. 2,00,000/- as additional dowry for the accused A1's cloth business; that the accused A1 to A3 inflicted cruelty upon LW1 in this regard; that in 2009 Avani month, LW1's parents gave Rs. 1,00,000 to A1; that A1 to A3 deceived LW1 and obtained the jewels that were worn by her during her marriage; that A1 had sold the jewels obtained from LW1, sold the said jewels and went to Kerala; that A2 and A3 did not give food to LW1 and her child; that they did not give any money to LW1 for the purpose of buying milk to LW1's child and treated LW1 cruelly; that when LW1 stated about the cruel acts of A2 and A3 to A1, he had asked LW1 to either stay in his house by listening to his parents or to get out of the house; that through the phone, A1 had stated to LW1 that he liked his uncle's daughter Thanga Maadathi; that through the phone, A1 had stated to LW1 that he and Thanga Madathi loved each other and that A1 unwillingly married LW1; that for about 2 – ½ years, the accused had been seeking for additional dowry and were inflicting cruelty upon LW1 by not giving money for her food; that about 2 – ½ years ago, the accused A1 to A3 had demanded LW1 to bring additional dowry of 10 sovereigns of jewels and Rs. 1,00,000 and that they had stated that only if LW1 brought the said dowry, will they not marry off A1 to Thanga Madathi; that when LW1 refused to do the same, the accused A1 to A3 had scolded LW1 by uttering the filthy words “சனியனே, தேவடியா முண்ட நீ செத்தால் தான் நாங்கள் நிம்மதியாக இருக்க முடியும்” towards LW1; that all the accused had stated to LW1 that they would go to Tiruppur for finding work, that all the accused would first go to Tiruppur for finding a house, that they would find work in Tiruppur and that they would then come and get LW1 from here to Tiruppur. In the final report,

it has further been alleged that A1 to A3 who had gone to Tiruppur did not come back; that A2 and A3 had come to Mangudi; that when LW1 asked A2 and A3 as to where her husband was, A2 and A3 stated to LW1 that A1 had married Thanga Madathi and was residing at Kerala, that A1 had filed divorce petition against LW1 in Sankarankovil Court; that A2 and A3 had stated to LW1 that she and her child had to survive by begging; that the accused had kicked LW1 out of the house; that the accused had deceived and obtained LW1's jewels from her; that the accused had demanded for additional dowry; that they had scolded LW1 obscenely; that they had inflicted cruelty upon her and that they had threatened to kill LW1. Hence, the accused A1 to A3 were charged for the offences u/s. 498A, 294(b), 406, 506(1) of Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Hereinafter IPC) and S. 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act (Hereinafter DP Act).

2. Cognizance:

On perusal of the charge sheet, this Court was satisfied that a prima facie case was made out against the accused A1 to A3. Hence, this Court took cognizance of the offences u/s. 498A, 294(b), 406, 506(1) of IPC and S. 4 of DP Act as against the accused A1 to A3 and issued summons to A1 to A3. Copies of the records was furnished to the accused A1 to A3, free of cost.

3. Framing of Charges:

On perusal of the records, this Court was satisfied that there is ground for proceeding against the accused A1 to A3. Hence, this Court framed charges for the offences u/s. 498A, 294(b), 406, 506(2) of IPC and S. 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act as against A1 to A3. Having understood the charges, the accused A1 to A3 pleaded

not guilty and claimed to be tried. Hence, this Court proceeded with trial of the case.

4. Prosecution Witnesses:

In order to prove its case, the Prosecution examined about 7 witnesses as PW1 to PW7. Ex.P.1 and Ex.P.2 were marked on behalf of the prosecution side. No material objects were marked. The Learned Assistant Public Prosecutor dispensed with the examination of the rest of the witnesses. Hence, the prosecution side evidence was closed.

5. Brief of the Prosecution side evidence:

PW1 is the defacto complainant and has been examined by the prosecution to prove the marriage which occurred between PW1 and A1; to prove the cruel acts inflicted by A1 to A3 for about 2 – ½ years and regarding the complaint given by PW1. PW5 (mother of PW1) has been listed as witness who could depose regarding the marriage which happened between PW1 and 1st accused, regarding the cruelty inflicted by A1 to A3 towards PW1 while demanding for additional dowry and regarding the complaint given by PW1. PW2, PW3 and PW4 have been examined by the prosecution to prove the marriage which occurred between PW1 and 1st accused and to prove that the accused A1 to A3 had inflicted cruelty towards PW1. PW6 is the police officer who registered FIR based on the complaint given by PW1. PW7 is the investigation officer who has deposed regarding the investigation process carried out in this case.

6. Proceedings u/s. 313 of Cr.P.C.:

Since A2 – Gurusamy had died on 10.09.2024, A1 and A3 alone were questioned u/s. 313(1)(b) of Cr.P.C. After the completion of prosecution evidence, accused A1 and A3 were questioned u/s. 313 of Cr.P.C. about incriminating evidences against them and they denied it. No Oral evidence and Documentary evidence has been adduced on the defence side. Defence side evidence was closed.

7. Point for determination:

On hearing both side arguments and perusing the documents and records, the questions that arises for consideration are:

Whether the Prosecution has proved the allegations u/s. 498A, 294(b), 406, 506(2) of IPC and S. 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act as against A1 and A3 beyond all reasonable doubts?

8. Appreciation of Evidence and Observations of the Court:

8.1. Both side arguments were heard and records were perused. Before looking into the point for consideration, it is pertinent to note that the burden to prove allegations against the accused beyond all reasonable doubts lies on the prosecution as u/s. 101 of Indian Evidence Act, 1872.

8.2. The Case of the prosecution is that on 24.02.2006, marriage happened between PW1 and A1; that the marriage happened in the presence of village elders; that during marriage, 16 sovereigns of gold jewels was given to PW1 and Rs. 70,000/- cash was given to A1's family members; that in 2009, A1 to A3 asked PW1 to pay Rs. 2,00,000/- as additional dowry for the accused A1's cloth business; that the accused A1 to A3 inflicted cruelty upon PW1 in this regard; that in 2009

Avani month, PW1's parents gave Rs. 1,00,000 to A1; that A1 to A3 deceived PW1 and obtained the jewels that were worn by her during her marriage; that A1 had sold the jewels obtained from PW1, sold the said jewels and went to Kerala; that A2 and A3 did not give food to PW1 and her child; that they did not give any money to PW1 for the purpose of buying milk to PW1's child and treated PW1 cruelly; that when PW1 stated about the cruel acts of A2 and A3 to A1, he had asked PW1 to either stay in his house by listening to his parents or to get out of the house; that through the phone, A1 had stated to PW1 that he liked his uncle's daughter Thanga Maadathi; that through the phone, A1 had stated to PW1 that he and Thanga Madathi loved each other and that A1 unwillingly married PW1; that for about 2 – ½ years, the accused had been seeking for additional dowry and were inflicting cruelty upon PW1 by not giving money for her food; that about 2 – ½ years ago, the accused A1 to A3 had demanded PW1 to bring additional dowry of 10 sovereigns of jewels and Rs. 1,00,000 and that they had stated that only if PW1 brought the said dowry, will they not marry off A1 to Thanga Madathi; that when PW1 refused to do the same, the accused A1 to A3 had scolded PW1 by uttering the filthy words “சனியனே, தேவடியா முண்ட நீ செத்தால் தான் நாங்கள் நிம்மதியாக இருக்க முடியும்” towards PW1; that all the accused had stated to PW1 that they would go to Tiruppur for finding work, that all the accused would first go to Tiruppur for finding a house, that they would find work in Tiruppur and that they would then come and get PW1 from here to Tiruppur. In the final report, it has further been alleged that A1 to A3 who had gone to Tiruppur did not come back; that A2 and A3 had come to Mangudi; that when PW1 asked A2 and A3 as to where her husband was, A2 and A3 stated to PW1 that A1 had married Thanga Madathi and was residing at Kerala, that A1 had filed divorce petition against PW1

in Sankarankovil Court; that A2 and A3 had stated to PW1 that she and her child had to survive by begging; that the accused had kicked PW1 out of the house; that the accused had deceived and obtained LW1's jewels from her; that the accused had demanded for additional dowry; that they had scolded PW1 obscenely; that they had inflicted cruelty upon her and that they had threatened to kill PW1. Hence, in this case, charges under sections u/s. 498A, 294(b), 406, 506(1) of IPC and S. 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act were framed against A1 to A3. It is now the burden of proof of prosecution to prove that the accused A1 to A3 had committed the aforesaid offences charged against them.

8.3. It was reported by the police that A2 – Gurusamy had died on 10.09.2024 and in this regard, death certificate of A2 had been produced. Considering the same, this Court concludes that the charges u/s. 294(b), 498A, 406, 506(2) of IPC and S. 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act framed stand abated, as against A2.

8.4. On perusal of final report, this Court finds that there is no mention of any specific date of occurrence and that as per the final report, the accused had demanded dowry and had been inflicting cruelty towards PW1 since 2009. In Ex.P.1. and Ex.P.2. also, it has been mentioned that the accused had been demanding dowry and had been inflicting cruelty towards PW1 since 2009. In Ex.P.1. and Ex.P.2., it has been mentioned that complaint petition was received and FIR was registered on 14.05.2013 at 16.00 hrs. On further perusal of Ex.P.1. and Ex.P.2., this Court finds that it has been mentioned in the said exhibits that PW1 had sustained cruelty in the hands of the accused for about 2 – ½ years since 2009 (i.e.) till 2012. On further perusal of Ex.P.1. and Ex.P.2., this Court finds that it has

been mentioned in the said exhibits that about 2 – ½ years after 2009, the accused A1 to A3 had again demanded for additional dowry; that they had uttered obscene words towards PW1 and that the accused had abandoned PW1. On analysis of the aforementioned facts, this Court is of the opinion that the most recent incident mentioned in Ex.P.1. and Ex.P.2. should have taken place in 2012. However, the complaint had been filed in 5th month of 2013. On analysis of the aforementioned facts, this Court is of the view that there was delay in filing of complaint. However, reason for such delay in filing of complaint has not been adduced in the said complaint. Hence, this Court is of the view that the delay in filing of complaint remains unexplained.

8.5. On the prosecution side, PW1 to PW7 have been examined. Ex.P.1 and Ex.P.2 were marked on prosecution side. PW1 is the defacto complainant and alleged victim. PW2 to PW5 have been listed as witnesses who would depose regarding the incident. PW6 is the police officer who registered FIR. PW7 is the investigation officer witness.

8.6. On perusal of testimony of PW1, this Court finds that with respect to involvement of A2 in the alleged incident, she has simply deposed that after fighting with PW1 on the day next to house warming ceremony of A1's sister, A3 had gone outside. Besides the said contention, PW1 has not deposed anything which establishes that A3 demanded dowry from PW1; that A3 inflicted cruel acts towards PW1 for the purpose of seeking dowry; that A3 uttered obscene words towards PW1; that A3 deceived PW1 with respect to the jewels which were given to her during marriage and that A3 threatened to kill PW1, at any point of time. On perusal of testimonies of other prosecution witnesses, namely, PW2 to PW7, this

Court finds that none of the said prosecution witnesses have deposed anything which establishes that A3 had committed the aforementioned acts against PW1. From the above discussion, this Court is of the opinion that the prosecution has failed to prove the charges u/s. 294(b), 406, 506(2), 498A of IPC and S. 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act framed as against A3, beyond all reasonable doubts.

8.7. Before looking into the individual charges framed against A1, this Court finds it essential to address certain material discrepancies in the prosecution case:

a) On perusal of Ex.P.1. and Ex.P.2., this Court finds that in the said exhibits, it has been mentioned that after the occurrence of marriage between PW1 and A1 on 24.02.2006 in Mangudi, they lived in Mangudi and that the offences which are alleged to have been committed by the accused were committed by them while they were living in Mangudi. However, in her chief examination, PW1 had deposed that the marriage between PW1 and A1 took place on 08.02.2006; that on the next day after marriage, she and A1 had gone to Tiruppur; that they lived there for 6 months; that in 2007 she delivered a baby boy; that 3 months after the same, A1 went to Mangudi to see his mother; that A1 had gone to Kerala for doing cloth business; that her husband stayed in Kerala for 6 months; that he came back to Tiruppur and took her and her child to Kerala; that they lived in Kerala for 4 months; that since they could not pay rent in Kerala, A1 asked PW1 to go to her parent's house; that after getting 16 sovereigns of gold jewels from PW1, he left her in her parent's house in Tiruppur; that A1 used to go to Tiruppur from Kerala for the purpose of visiting PW1; that her husband took her to Mangudi for celebrating Pongal; that on hearing from others regarding A1's alleged affair with another woman, PW1 refused to go to Tiruppur and stayed in Mangudi for 4 months; that

A1 used to come to PW1's house in Mangudi; that one day before the house warming ceremony of A1's sister, A1 fought with her and sent her to her parent's house in Tiruppur; that on hearing that A1 was in a woman's house in Rayagiri, PW1 came from Tiruppur to Mangudi; that A3 fought with PW1 and went outside; that A1 deceived PW1 and tried to kill her by tying rope around her neck; that she was taken to Thalavaipuram hospital for treatment by nearby persons; that she was then taken to Rajapalayam hospital for further treatment; that A1 threatened PW1 not to reveal the incidents; that A1 took PW1 to psychiatric hospital for getting certificate for the purpose of doing 2nd marriage; that the doctor therein certified that her condition was normal; that then she and A1 went to Rayagiri for seeing her father in law Gurusamy; that on hearing from her father in law, that A1 was going to marry Gurusamy's sister's daughter, PW1 took up the matter before village elders; that after the said meeting with elders, A1 took PW1 back to Tiruppur; that after leaving PW1 and her child in Tiruppur, A1 did not come back to Tiruppur; that PW1 went to Mangudi and Kerala to look for her husband (A1); that she gave complaint in Karivalamvantha Nallur police station with respect to her husband's missing; that on the same day night, A1 heard through phone that A1 had gone to Tiruppur; that when PW1 went to Tiruppur, she came to know that before she could go there, he had gone from there; that PW1 then gave complaint in Sankarankovil All Women Police Station. As per the aforementioned PW1's testimony, it is clear that after her marriage, PW1 and A1 did not only stay in the accused's house in Mangudi; that they had lived in Tiruppur, Mangudi, Kerala and Rayagiri, during varying time periods after their marriage till the date when PW1 gave complaint in Sankarankovil police station. However, there is no mention of PW1 and A1 residing together in Kerala, Rayagiri and Tiruppur during the time

period of occurrence of the offences. On further perusal of Ex.P.1., this Court finds that in para 2 of the said exhibit, it has been mentioned that when PW1 asked the accused to take her to Kerala, he refused to do so. Such contention in Ex.P.1. is in contradiction to PW1's aforementioned testimony. Further, Ex.P.1 and PW1's testimony are not in consonance with each other, with respect to the date of marriage (between A1 and PW1). On comparative analysis of PW1's testimony and Ex.P.1., this Court finds that both the said versions are in contradiction to each other, with respect to the place of occurrence of the offences and with respect to the date of marriage. In this context, this Court is of the opinion that such contradictions are material. In this regard, this Court finds it essential to point out that in this case, the investigation officer did not investigate the place of occurrence and did not prepare observation magazhar and rough sketch, which would aid this Court in ascertaining the exact place of occurrence of the offences. In such circumstances, this Court opines that material ambiguity with respect to the place of occurrence remains unresolved and such ambiguity is fatal to the prosecution case.

b) In para 4 of Ex.P.1., the acts of cruelty alleged to have been committed by the accused have been mentioned. In the said para in Ex.P.1., it has also been mentioned that she gave complaint against the accused in Karivalamvantha Nallur police station and that after the same, since the accused had vouched that they would not act cruelly against PW1 and that they would maintain her properly, PW1 entered into a compromise with them. However, during her cross examination, PW1 deposed as follows: “2010 ம் வருடம் எனது கணவர் எனக்கு எதிராக விவாகரத்து கோரி வழக்கு தாக்கல் செய்ததிலிருந்து நான் அவருக்கு எதிராக புகார் அளித்து வருகிறேன் என்றால் சரிதான். நான் அவ்வாறு எங்கெல்லாம்

புகார் கொடுத்தேன் என்றால் முடியாளில் சங்கரன்கோவிலில் புகார் கொடுத்தேன். பின்பு சிவகிறியில் புகார் கொடுத்தேன். அதன்பிறகு திருநெல்வேலியிலும், திருப்பூரிலும், கரிவலம்வந்த நல்லூரிலும் புகார் கொடுத்தேன். திருப்பூரில் புகார் கொடுத்த போது சங்கரன்கோவிலில் வழக்கு பதிவு செய்யப்பட்டதாக சொன்னார்கள்..... நான் போலீசார் விசாரணையில் ஏங்கெங்கு புகார் கொடுத்தேன் என்ற விபரத்தையும், எப்போது புகார் கொடுத்தேன் என்ற விபரத்தையும் கூறியுள்ளேனா என்றால் கூறியுள்ளேன்.” On comparative analysis of the aforementioned testimony of PW1 and Ex.P.1., this Court is of the opinion that both the versions are in contradiction with each other, with respect to the number of complaints filed against the accused. Also, both the complaint (Ex.P.1.) and chief examination testimony of PW1 do not speak about the aforementioned complaints (other than those which were alleged to have been filed in Karivalamvantha Nallur police station and Sankarankovil All Women Police Station). They do not speak about the reason for which the said complaints were filed by PW1 against the accused and about the action taken with respect to the said complaints. Further, bare reading of para 4 of Ex.P.1., shows that PW1 gave complaint in Karivalamvantha Nallur police station due to the alleged acts of cruelty committed by the accused towards her in Mangudi. However, in this regard, during her chief examination, PW1 has deposed that after leaving PW1 and her child in Tiruppur, A1 did not come back to Tiruppur; that PW1 went to Mangudi and Kerala to look for her husband (A1); that she gave complaint in Karivalamvantha Nallur police station with respect to her husband’s missing; that on the same day night, A1 heard through phone that A1 had gone to Tiruppur; that when PW1 went to Tiruppur, she came to know that before she could go there, he had gone from there and that PW1 then gave

complaint in Sankarankovil All Women Police Station. On comparative analysis of the aforementioned contentions given in Ex.P.1 and in PW1's chief examination testimony, this Court finds that both the versions are in contradiction to each other, with respect to the reason for which a complaint was filed in Karivalamvantha Nallur police station and then in Sankarankovil Town police station. From the above discussion, this Court is of the view that the aforementioned discrepancies with respect to the number of complaints and the reason for filing such complaints are material and that they gravely weaken the prosecution case.

c) In addition to this, during her cross examination, PW1 has deposed as follows: “2010 ம் வருடம் எனது கணவர் எனக்கு எதிராக விவாகரத்து கோரி வழக்கு தாக்கல் செய்ததிலிருந்து நான் அவருக்கு எதிராக புகார் அளித்து வருகிறேன் என்றால் சரிதான்... என் கணவர் விவாகரத்து வழக்கு போட்டதிலிருந்து நான் அவருடன் தற்போது சேர்ந்து வாழவில்லை என்றால் சரிதான்.” In Ex.P.1 and Ex.P.2., it has been mentioned that the accused had been demanding dowry and had been inflicting cruelty towards PW1 since 2009 till the date of filing of complaint by PW1 (i.e.) 14.05.2013. On comparative analysis of Ex.P.1. and aforementioned PW1's testimony, this Court is of the opinion that the above stated testimony of PW1 gives rise to grave suspicion as to whether PW1 and A1 actually lived together from 2010 onwards. This gives rise to further suspicion as to whether the accused A1 had actually committed the offences charged against him which are alleged to have been done by him, after 2010. In this regard, this Court is of the view that the above stated grave suspicions shake the very core of prosecution case.

8.8. This Court will now look into the charges framed against the accused A1 individually as follows:

A) Charge u/s. 294(b) of IPC:

8.9. The essential ingredients to establish the accusation u/s. 294(b) of IPC are: i) uttering obscene words, ii) in or near any public place, iii) such utterance should have caused annoyance to the public.

8.10. In final report dated 05.09.2014, it has been mentioned that about 2 – ½ years ago, the accused A1 to A3 had demanded PW1 to bring additional dowry of 10 sovereigns of jewels and Rs. 1,00,000; that they had stated that only if PW1 brought the said dowry, will they not marry off A1 to Thanga Madathi; that when PW1 refused to do the same, the accused A1 to A3 had scolded PW1 by uttering the filthy words “சனியனே, தேவடியா முண்ட நீ செத்தால் தான் நாங்கள் நிம்மதியாக இருக்க முடியும்” towards her. In para 3 of Ex.P.1., it has been mentioned that on hearing rumors spread by A2 and A3, A1 doubted PW1 and uttered obscene words towards her. In para 4 of Ex.P.1., it has been mentioned that when the village elders and PW1’s parents criticized the accused’s behaviour, they asked them not to interfere in their family business and scolded them using obscene words and that when PW1 refused to give the additional dowry of 10 sovereign jewels and Rs. 1,00,000 (which was demanded by the accused), all three accused uttered the obscene words “சனியனே, தேவடியா முண்டே நீ செத்தால் தான் நாங்கள் நிம்மதியாக இருக்க முடியும்” towards PW1. On perusal of final report, Ex.P.1. and Ex.P.2., this Court finds that there is no mention of date and time of occurrence of the offences. Also, as already discussed above in para 8.7.,

there are material ambiguities and contradictions with respect to place of occurrence of the offences, which stands unresolved.

8.11. In addition to this, on perusal of PW1's testimony, this Court finds that she has not deposed anything regarding the obscene words alleged to have been uttered by the accused towards PW1. On perusal of testimonies of other prosecution witnesses, namely, PW2 to PW7, this Court finds that the said prosecution witnesses have also not deposed anything regarding the obscene words alleged to have been uttered by the accused towards PW1. From the above discussion, this Court is of the opinion that the prosecution has failed to prove the charge u/s. 294(b) of IPC as against A1 beyond all reasonable doubts.

B) Charge u/s. 506(2) of IPC:

8.12. The essential ingredients to establish charge u/s. 506(2) of IPC are: 1) threat to cause injury to person, property or to the person or reputation of any anyone in whom that person is interested, 2) Such threat should have been made with an intention to cause alarm and 3) Such threat should be threat to cause death or grievous hurt or to cause destruction of any property by fire, to cause an offence punishable with death or imprisonment for life, or with imprisonment for a term which may extend to seven years, or to impute unchastity to a woman.

8.13. In final report, it has been mentioned that all three accused had demanded for additional dowry; that they had scolded PW1 obscenely; that they had inflicted cruelty upon her and that they had threatened to kill PW1. There is no mention of the manner in which all three accused threatened to kill the accused. There is no mention of date, time and place in which the aforementioned threatening words were allegedly uttered by the accused towards PW1. In Ex.P.1.

and Ex.P.2., it has been mentioned that when PW1 refused to give the additional dowry of 10 sovereign jewels and Rs. 1,00,000 (which was demanded by the accused), all three accused uttered the obscene words “சனியனே, தேவிடியா முண்டே நீ செத்தால் தான் நாங்கள் நிம்மதியாக இருக்க முடியும்” towards PW1 and that they beat her for the whole night. In Ex.P.1 and Ex.P.2. also, there is no mention of the specific date, time and place in which the aforementioned incident allegedly took place. Such non-mention of date, time and place of occurrence of the incident gravely weakens the prosecution case.

8.14. On perusal of PW1’s testimony, this Court finds that during her chief examination, she has mentioned that she has not mentioned the aforementioned threatening incident which is mentioned in Ex.P.1. Instead, she has deposed in her chief examination that on hearing that the women who was having affair with A1 and her family members had come to Mangudi, PW1 came to Mangudi from Tiruppur; that during night of the said day, PW1’s husband had gone to Rayagiri; that on the next day, A3 fought with PW1 and went outside; that at that time, her husband spoke well with her; that her husband asked PW1 to buy tablets for her head ache; that after getting the tablets from her, A1 asked PW1 to buy juice for him; that after that, A1 asked her to eat the food; that due to the tablet mixed in the food, the food tasted bitter; that PW1 ate the bitter food; that after the same, when PW1 laid down to sleep after eating, A1 strangled PW1’s neck using rope and tried to lift her to hang her from the fan; that PW1 was looking at him numbly; that A1 could not lift her; that when other persons came there and knocked the door, A1 stated to them that PW1 tried to commit suicide and he had got her down and that nearby persons took PW1 to the hospital. From the aforementioned testimony of PW1, it is clear that PW1 had deposed that A1 had attempted to murder her.

However, on perusal of Ex.P.1. (complaint given by PW1), this Court finds that there is no mention of the above stated attempt made by A1 to murder of PW1. On further perusal of PW1's testimony, this Court finds that she has not deposed anything regarding the reason for non-mentioning of the aforementioned attempt made by A1 to kill PW1 in the complaint given by her (Ex.P.1.). On comparative analysis of the aforementioned testimony of PW1 and Ex.P.1., this Court finds that both the versions are not in consonance with each other, with respect to the manner in which A1 threatened to kill PW1 and with respect to the overt act of the accused A1 while making such threat.

8.15. In this regard, PW2 has deposed in his chief examination that in 2010, when he was Mangudi's village head man, PW1 and her family members came to panchayat; that PW1's father stated that A1 had put rope around PW1's neck and that he saw the rope mark in PW1's neck. However, during his cross examination, PW2 deposed that he did not know directly about the problem for which PW1 and her family came to Panchayat; that he did not know directly as to who strangled PW1's neck and that police did not investigate him in this regard. PW3 has deposed in his chief examination that A1 called him stating that PW1 was sick; that PW1 ought to be taken to the hospital and that A1 called PW3 to come from Thalavaipuram to the hospital. PW3 then deposed in his chief examination that there were strangulation marks found in PW1's neck and that her eyes were found blood shot. On perusal of the above-mentioned testimonies of PW2 and PW3, this Court is of the opinion that their testimonies appear to corroborate PW1's testimony with respect to the attempt alleged to have been made by A1 to kill PW1. However, this Court finds it essential to point out despite such corroboration, the question as to why the facts regarding such attempt to murder PW1 alleged to

have been committed by A1 was not mentioned in Ex.P.1. remains unanswered. On further perusal of testimonies of PW2 and PW3, this Court finds that there is no mention of any other overt act of threatening to kill PW1 alleged to have been done by A1 in the said testimonies. Hence, the testimonies of PW2 and PW3 are not in consonance with Ex.P.1., with respect to the threat issued by A1 towards PW1. On perusal of testimonies of other prosecution witnesses, namely, PW4 to PW7, this Court finds that they have not deposed anything regarding the threatening words alleged to have been uttered by the accused towards PW1.

8.16. In light of the above discussion, this Court is of the opinion that the prosecution has failed to prove the charge u/s. 506(2) of IPC as against A1, beyond all reasonable doubts.

C) Charge u/s. 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act:

8.17. Essential ingredients to establish charge u/s. 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act are: a) Any person should have made a demand for any dowry; b) Such demand could be made directly or indirectly; c) Such demand should have been made to parents or other relatives or guardian of bride or bridegroom.

8.18. In the present case, in final report, it has been mentioned that on 24.02.2006, marriage happened between PW1 and A1; that the marriage happened in the presence of village elders; that during marriage, 16 sovereigns of gold jewels was given to PW1 and Rs. 70,000/- cash was given to A1's family members; that in 2009, A1 to A3 asked PW1 to pay Rs. 2,00,000/- as additional dowry for the accused A1's cloth business; that the accused A1 to A3 inflicted cruelty upon PW1 in this regard; that in 2009 Avani month, PW1's parents gave Rs. 1,00,000 to A1 and that about 2 – ½ years ago, the accused A1 to A3 had demanded PW1 to bring

additional dowry of 10 sovereigns of jewels and Rs. 1,00,000. In Ex.P.1. and Ex.P.2., it has been mentioned that on 24.02.2006, marriage between PW1 and A1 took place; that during the marriage, 16 sovereigns of gold jewels and Rs. 70,000 were given as dowry to 1st accused; that one day in 2009, all three accused demanded PW1 to pay Rs. 2,00,000 as additional dowry to aid A1 to start clothing business; that after PW1 had stated about the same to her parents, in January 2009, they gave Rs. 1,00,000 to A1 after availing the said amount as loan; that all the three accused then forcefully took her jewels; that after about 2 – ½ years, all three accused demanded PW1 to bring 10 sovereigns of gold jewels and Rs. 1,00,000 as additional dowry and imposed condition that they would marry off A1 to another woman if PW1 did not give the said additional dowry.

8.19. In this regard, PW1 has deposed in her chief examination that on 08.02.2006, marriage took place between A1 and PW1 in Mangudi marriage hall; that during the marriage, 16 sovereign gold jewels and Rs. 20,000 were given as dowry; that utensils were also given as dowry; that A1 demanded PW1's mother to give amount for setting up a business; that PW1 gave chit amount of Rs. 1,00,000 to her mother for the purpose of helping A1 to start his business; that A1 asked for her jewels to start a cloth business; that A1 alone went to Kerala for doing business; that A1 stayed there for about 6 months; that A1 took PW1 and her child to Kerala where they stayed together for 4 months and that since they could not pay rent, A1 left PW1 and her child in her mother's house which is in Tiruppur, after getting 16 sovereigns of gold jewels from her. On comparative analysis of the aforementioned PW1's testimony and Ex.P.1., this Court finds that both the versions are not in consonance with each other, with respect to the date of marriage (between PW1 and A1) and with respect to details of dowry given during their

marriage. This is because during PW1's chief examination, she deposed that 16 sovereigns of gold jewels and Rs. 20,000 were given as dowry at the time of her marriage and that her marriage with A1 took place on 08.02.2006. However, in Ex.P.1., it has been mentioned that the marriage between PW1 and A1 took place on 24.02.2006 and that during her marriage with A1, 16 sovereigns of gold jewels and Rs. 70,000 were given as dowry. In this regard, PW1 has deposed in her cross examination as follows: “பொதுவாக எங்கள் சமுதாயத்தில் திருமணம் நடைபெறும் போது கொடுக்கப்படும் சீர்சீராட்டுகள் பற்றி எழுதி வைப்பார்கள் என்றால் சரிதான். அவ்வாறு எனது திருமணத்தின் போது கொடுக்கப்பட்ட சீர்சீராட்டுகள் பொறுத்து எழுதிவைக்கப்பட்ட ஆவணம் எதையும் போலீசாரிடமோ, நீதிமன்றத்திலோ சமர்ப்பித்தேனா என்றால் இல்லை.” As per the aforementioned cross examination testimony of PW1, a written document bearing the list of dowry given during her marriage is alleged to have been made. However, the said document had not been filed to prove her claim and to clear the ambiguity with respect to the date of marriage and with respect to details of dowry given during her marriage. Further, PW1 has not deposed anything regarding the demand for additional dowry (10 sovereigns of jewels and Rs. 1,00,000) which is alleged to have been made by the accused A1 to A3, about 2 – ½ years after marriage. Further, with regards to the dowry of Rs. 1,00,000 which is alleged to have been given to A1 for cloth business, she has deposed in her chief examination that A1 demanded PW1's mother to give amount for setting up a business and that PW1 gave chit amount of Rs. 1,00,000 to her mother for the purpose of helping A1 to start his business. However, in Ex.P.1., it has been mentioned that one day in 2009, all three accused demanded PW1 to pay Rs. 2,00,000 as additional dowry to aid A1 to start clothing business and that after

PW1 had stated about the same to her parents, in January 2009, they gave Rs. 1,00,000 to A1 after availing the said amount as loan. On comparative analysis of the aforementioned contentions mentioned in Ex.P.1. and PW1's testimony, this Court finds that the above said two versions are not in consonance with each other, with respect to the amount alleged to have been demanded; with respect to the persons who demanded the additional amount; with respect to the person who they made the demand to and with respect to the person who gave them the said additional dowry of Rs. 1,00,000.

8.20. On perusal of testimonies of PW2 and PW3, this Court finds that both the said witnesses have not deposed anything regarding the alleged demand for dowry made by the accused towards PW1. PW4 has deposed in her chief examination has deposed that PW1 is her sister's daughter; that during marriage, Rs. 70,000 and 16 sovereigns of gold jewels were given to PW1; that the accused A1 demanded Rs. 1,00,000 for his business purpose; that PW4's sister gave Rs. 1,00,000 to A1; that again Rs. 1,00,000 was asked by A1 and that for the same, they did not give any amount to A1. During her cross examination, PW4 has admitted that she did not know directly about the problem which happened after the marriage of A1 and PW1, in their family and that she heard that dispute arose in their family. On comparative analysis of testimonies of PW1 and PW4, this Court finds that both the versions are not in consonance with each other, with respect to details of dowry given during PW1's marriage and with respect to the amount demanded by A1 for his business. Further, PW4 has not deposed that the dowry given during marriage of PW1 was given as a result of demand made by the accused. Also, PW4 has not deposed anything regarding the additional dowry of Rs. 1,00,000 and 10 sovereigns of gold jewels, demanded by the accused A1 to A3

from PW1. PW5, who is the mother of PW1, has deposed in her chief examination that about 29 years ago, marriage between PW1 and A1 was conducted in Mangudi marriage hall in front of village head man and elders; that during marriage, 16 sovereigns of jewels were promised to be given; that only 11 sovereigns were actually given as dowry; that Rs. 70,000 was also given as dowry; that 2 years after the marriage, 1st accused asked for Rs. 1,00,000 from them; that the remaining 5 sovereigns of jewels were given to the accused and that Rs. 1,00,000 which was being saved for their 2nd daughter's marriage was also given to the accused. On perusal of PW5's aforementioned testimony, this Court is of the opinion that her testimony is in contradiction with PW1's testimony and Ex.P,1., with respect to details of the dowry given at the time of marriage, with respect to the time period when marriage took place and with respect to the persons who demanded the additional dowry of Rs. 1,00,000. Also, PW5 has not deposed anything regarding the demand for Rs. 1,00,000 and 10 sovereigns of gold jewels which is alleged to have been made by the accused towards PW1. Further, during her cross examination, PW5 has also mentioned that in their community, they used to write a document listing the dowry given to the bride and that they did not submit such document which was prepared during marriage of PW1 and A1. However, in this regard, PW7 (investigation officer) deposed during her cross examination as follows: “அ.சா.1ன் சமுதாய வழக்கப்படி திருமண நிச்சயதார்த்தத்தின் போது அவர்கள் சமுதாய நாட்டாண்மையின் முன்பு பட்டோலை எழுதப்படும் என்ற விபரம் எதுவும் எனது விசாரணையில் துலங்குமா என்றால் துலங்காது.” The aforementioned cross examination testimony of PW7 is in contradiction with testimonies of PW1 and PW5 with respect to the existence

pattolai document which is alleged to have been prepared during marriage of PW1 and which contains the list of dowry given to the bride during her marriage.

8.21. From the above discussion, this Court is of the opinion that there are material discrepancies with respect to the details of dowry alleged to have been given; with respect to the persons to whom the dowry was given and with respect to the details additional dowry alleged to have been given to accused. Further, both PW1 and PW5 have not deposed that the dowry was given on demand made by the accused. This Court is of the further opinion that the aforementioned discrepancies are material and that such material discrepancies stand unresolved. Hence, this Court is of the view that the prosecution has failed to prove the charge u/s. 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act, as against A1, beyond all reasonable doubts.

D) Charge u/s. 406 of IPC:

8.22. S. 406 of IPC provides for punishment for person committing criminal breach of trust. S. 405 of IPC provides definition for criminal breach of trust as follows: ‘Whoever, being in any manner, entrusted with property or with any dominion over property dishonestly misappropriates or convert to his own use that property or dishonestly disposes off that property in violation of any direction of law prescribing the mode in which such trust is to be discharged, or of any legal contract, express or implied, which he has made touching the discharge of such trust or wilfully suffers any other person so to do, commits criminal breach of trust.’

8.23. In the present case, in final report, it has been mentioned that the accused had deceived and obtained PW1’s jewels from her. There is no mention of date, time and place of occurrence of the said incident in final report. In Ex.P.1.

and Ex.P.2., it has been mentioned that in 2009, the accused A1 to A3 had taken all the jewels given to PW1 during her marriage forcibly from PW1; that A1 sold the said jewels and took it with him to Kerala. In this regard, PW1 deposed in her chief examination that her husband got 16 sovereigns of gold jewels from PW1 (which were given to her during her marriage) and that A1 then sent PW1 to her mother's house. On perusal of testimonies of PW2 and PW3, this Court finds that both the said witnesses have not deposed anything which establishes that A1 forcibly took jewels given to PW1. In this context, PW4 has deposed in her chief examination that at the time of marriage, Rs. 70,000 and 16 sovereigns of gold jewels were given. PW4 has not mentioned as to whether the said amount and jewels were given to the accused and whether such amount and jewels were given on demand made by the accused. PW4 has also not deposed anything regarding the accused forcibly taking away the 16 sovereigns of jewels given to PW1 during her marriage. In this regard, PW5 has deposed in her chief examination that during PW1's marriage, 16 sovereigns of jewels were stated to be given; that out of the same, 11 sovereigns of jewels were given as dowry; that Rs. 70,000 were given; that the remaining 5 sovereigns of jewels were also given; that they gave Rs. 1,00,000 which was kept for their 2nd daughter's marriage and that after getting the amount and jewels, A1, PW1's daughter and A3 went to Mangudi. On perusal of testimonies of remaining prosecution witnesses, namely, PW6 and PW7, this Court finds that they have not deposed anything which establishes that the accused forcibly took jewels from PW1. From the above discussion, it is clear that only PW1 and PW5 have deposed that the accused had taken the jewels given to PW1 during her marriage.

8.24. On comparative analysis of testimonies of PW1 and PW5, as already discussed above, this Court finds that both the versions are not in consonance with each other, with respect to the date of marriage of PW1 with A1 and with respect to details of jewels given at the time of marriage. In this regard, while both the witnesses have deposed that a pattolai (containing the list of dowry given to PW1) was made with respect to the jewels given to PW1 during her marriage, no such document was submitted before this Court to clarify the aforementioned ambiguities with respect to the date of marriage of PW1 with A1 and with respect to details of jewels given at the time of marriage. Further, the testimonies of PW1 and PW5 are in contradiction with each other, with regards to the persons who allegedly took the jewels and with regards to the place they went afterwards. This is because, on one hand, PW1 has deposed that her husband (A1) took her jewels and that he went to Kerala while leaving behind PW1 in her mother's house in Tiruppur and on the other hand, PW5 has deposed that after taking the jewels given to PW1, A1, A3 and PW1 went to Mangudi. From the above discussion, this Court is of the opinion that the above stated discrepancies between testimonies of PW1 and PW5 are material and are fatal to the prosecution case. Hence, this Court is of the opinion that the prosecution has failed to prove the charge u/s. 406 of IPC as against A1 beyond all reasonable doubts.

E) Charge u/s. 498A of IPC:

8.25. S. 498A of IPC provides for punishment to any person, whoever, being the husband or the relative of husband of a woman, subjects such woman to cruelty. Explanation in the said section provides for definition of 'cruelty' as follows: (a) any wilful conduct which is of such a nature as is likely to drive the

woman to commit suicide or to cause grave injury or danger to life, limb or health (whether mental or physical) of the woman; or (b) harassment of the woman where such harassment is with a view to coercing her or any person related to her to meet any unlawful demand for any property or valuable security or is on account of failure by her or any person related to her to meet such demand

8.26. In the present case, in final report, it has been mentioned that on 24.02.2006, marriage happened between PW1 and A1; that the marriage happened in the presence of village elders; that during marriage, 16 sovereigns of gold jewels was given to PW1 and Rs. 70,000/- cash was given to A1's family members; that in 2009, A1 to A3 asked PW1 to pay Rs. 2,00,000/- as additional dowry for the accused A1's cloth business; that the accused A1 to A3 inflicted cruelty upon PW1 in this regard; that in 2009 Avani month, PW1's parents gave Rs. 1,00,000 to A1; that A1 to A3 deceived PW1 and obtained the jewels that were worn by her during her marriage; that A1 had sold the jewels obtained from PW1, sold the said jewels and went to Kerala; that A2 and A3 did not give food to PW1 and her child; that they did not give any money to PW1 for the purpose of buying milk to PW1's child and treated PW1 cruelly; that when PW1 stated about the cruel acts of A2 and A3 to A1, he had asked PW1 to either stay in his house by listening to his parents or to get out of the house; that through the phone, A1 had stated to PW1 that he liked his uncle's daughter Thanga Maadathi; that through the phone, A1 had stated to PW1 that he and Thanga Madathi loved each other and that A1 unwillingly married PW1; that for about 2 – ½ years, the accused had been seeking for additional dowry and were inflicting cruelty upon PW1 by not giving money for her food; that about 2 – ½ years ago, the accused A1 to A3 had demanded PW1 to bring additional dowry of 10 sovereigns of jewels and Rs. 1,00,000 and that they had

stated that only if PW1 brought the said dowry, will they not marry off A1 to Thanga Madathi; that when PW1 refused to do the same, the accused A1 to A3 had scolded PW1 by uttering the filthy words “சனியனே, தேவடியா முண்ட நீ செத்தால் தான் நாங்கள் நிம்மதியாக இருக்க முடியும்” towards PW1; that all the accused had stated to PW1 that they would go to Tiruppur for finding work, that all the accused would first go to Tiruppur for finding a house, that they would find work in Tiruppur and that they would then come and get PW1 from here to Tiruppur. In the final report, it has further been alleged that A1 to A3 who had gone to Tiruppur did not come back; that A2 and A3 had come to Mangudi; that when PW1 asked A2 and A3 as to where her husband was, A2 and A3 stated to PW1 that A1 had married Thanga Madathi and was residing at Kerala, that A1 had filed divorce petition against PW1 in Sankarankovil Court; that A2 and A3 had stated to PW1 that she and her child had to survive by begging; that the accused had kicked PW1 out of the house; that the accused had deceived and obtained PW1’s jewels from her; that the accused had demanded for additional dowry; that they had scolded PW1 obscenely; that they had inflicted cruelty upon her and that they had threatened to kill PW1.

8.27. As already discussed above, this Court finds that there is no mention of specific date, time and place of occurrence offences. Further, as already discussed above in 8.7., this Court is of the opinion that there is grave suspicion as to whether PW1 and A1 actually lived together from 2010 onwards. On comparative analysis of Ex.P.1. and PW1’s testimony, this Court is of the opinion that the incidents of cruelty mentioned in Ex.P.1. has not been mentioned by PW1 in her testimony and that there is no mention of the attempt made by A1 to murder PW1 (which is deposed by PW1 in her chief examination) in Ex.P.1. On perusal of testimonies of

PW2 and PW3, this Court finds that they have not deposed anything regarding the incidents of cruelty mentioned in Ex.P.1. On further perusal of testimonies of PW2 and PW3, this Court is of the opinion that their testimonies appear to corroborate PW1's testimony with respect to the attempt alleged to have been made by A1 to kill PW1. However, this Court finds it essential to point out despite such corroboration, the question as to why the facts regarding such attempt to murder PW1 alleged to have been committed by A1 was not mentioned in Ex.P.1. remains unanswered. On perusal of PW4's testimony, this Court finds that PW4 has deposed in her chief examination that A1 and PW1 fought with each other and that she does not the reason for their fight. PW4 has not deposed anything other than that, regarding the act of cruelty which is alleged to have been done by the accused towards PW1. On perusal of PW5's testimony, this Court finds that she has deposed that the 1st accused had an affair with another person and that other than that, PW5 has not deposed anything regarding the cruel acts of the accused alleged to have been committed by the accused towards PW1. Besides the said witnesses, other prosecution witnesses, namely, PW6 and PW7 have not deposed anything which establishes that the accused committed cruel acts towards PW1. From the above discussion, this Court is of the view that there are material contradictions with regards to the cruel acts alleged to have been committed by the accused A1 and A3 towards PW1 and that such contradictions stand unresolved. Hence, this Court is of the opinion that the prosecution has failed to prove the charge u/s. 498A of IPC as against A1 beyond all reasonable doubts.

8.28. On the whole, this Court concludes that the prosecution has failed to prove the charges framed u/s. 498A, 294(b), 406, 506(2) of IPC and S. 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act as against A1 and A3, beyond all reasonable doubts.

9. Finding of the Court:

The prosecution has failed to prove the charges framed u/s. 498A, 294(b), 406, 506(2) of IPC and S. 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act as against A1 and A3, beyond all reasonable doubts.

11. Decision:

In the result,

The accused A2 – Gurusamy had died on 10.09.2024 (i.e.) during pendency of the trial. Hence, charges framed /s. 498(A), 294(b), 406, 506(2) of IPC and 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act stand abated as against him.

Accused A1 and A3 are found not guilty for the offences u/s. 498A, 294(b), 406, 506(2) of IPC and S. 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act and are acquitted u/s. 248(1) of Cr.P.C.

No property was produced before this Court.

If any, bail bonds executed by the accused A1 and A3, are ordered to be cancelled after the expiry of the appeal period.

This judgment was typed by me in my laptop, corrected and pronounced by me in the Open Court on 4th June, 2026.

Additional District Munsif / Judicial Magistrate

Sankarankovil.

Appendix – A

Prosecution side Witnesses:

PW5 (mother of PW1) has been listed as. PW2, PW3 and PW4 have been examined by the prosecution to. PW6 is the police officer who registered FIR based on the complaint given by PW1. PW7 is the investigation officer who has deposed regarding the investigation process carried out in this case.

S.No.	Rank of Witness	Name of Witness	Remarks
1.	PW1	Kavitha	Defacto Complainant
2.	PW2	Kallakondan	Witness who could depose regarding the marriage which occurred between PW1 and 1 st accused and regarding the cruelty inflicted by A1 to A3 towards PW1
3.	PW3	Thangadurai	Witness who could depose regarding the marriage which occurred between PW1 and 1 st accused and regarding the cruelty inflicted by A1 to A3 towards PW1
4.	PW4	Ponnuthaai	Witness who could depose regarding the marriage which occurred between PW1 and 1 st accused and regarding the cruelty inflicted by A1 to A3 towards PW1
5.	PW5	Pachaikili	Witness who could depose regarding the marriage which happened between PW1 and 1 st accused, regarding the cruelty inflicted by A1 to A3 towards PW1 while demanding for additional dowry and

			regarding the complaint given by PW1
6.	PW6	Rameshwari	Police officer who registered FIR
7.	PW7	Meenaal	Investigation officer

Appendix – B

Prosecution side Exhibits:

S.No.	Exhibit	Description of Document
1.	Ex.P.1	Complaint
2.	Ex.P.2	First Information Report

Appendix – C

Material Objects – Nil

Appendix – D

Defence side Witness – Nil

Appendix – E

Defence side Exhibits - Nil

Additional District Munsif / Judicial Magistrate
Sankarankovil.