

**IN THE COURT OF THE ADDITIONAL JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE OF FIRST
CLASS- CUM – ADDITIONAL CIVIL JUDGE (JUNIOR DIVISION):
GUDIVADA.**

Present: **Ms. Arundhati,**

Additional Judicial Magistrate of First Class, Gudivada

Tuesday, this the 24th day of March, 2026

CALENDER CASE NO.774 of 2021

Between:

State: Represented by the Sub-Inspector of Police,
Gudivada I Town Police Station.

... Complainant

And

1. Mohammad Shershabdar Ali, S/o Ashraf Ali,
aged 33 years,
2. Mohammed Ashraf Ali, S/o Mohammad Sher Ali,
aged about 64 years,
3. Meharunnisa, W/o Ashraf Ali,
aged about 55 years,
4. Afzalunnis, D/o Ashraf Ali,
aged about 39 years,
all are R/o Dhanavayipeta, Rajahmundry

... Accused nos.1 to 4

This case is come up on 02.03.2026 before this Court for final hearing in the presence of Learned Assistant Public Prosecutor for the State/Complainant and of Sri Y.Ankineed Prasad, learned counsel for the accused and upon hearing on both sides and the matter having stood over for consideration till this day, this Court delivered the following:

J U D G M E N T

1. The Sub-Inspector of Police, Gudivada I Town Police Station filed charge sheet against the accused in Crime No.331/2020 of Gudivada I Town Police Station for the offence punishable under Sections 498-A of Indian Penal Code (in brevity I.P.C) and Sec.3 & 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act. The accused is charged and tried for the said offence.

2. The case of the prosecution in brief is that the informant namely Shaik Shehanaz and accused wife and husband whose marriage is performed on 14.05.2017 at Gudivada Officer's club in the presence of both side elders. At the time of the marriage, her parents presented Rs.10,00,000/- towards dowry, 160 grams of gold, gold bracelet and 40grms of gold chain to accused no.1 and also Rs.1,50,000/- under concept of jahez. After some days the informant went to Hyderabad along with accused no.1 from his house. Accused no.1 convinced the informant not to have children until they were well settled and to the informant to use medicines prescribed by the doctor. After that the accused no.1 addicted to online gaming and share market business, he used all the money given by informant parents i.e., Lws.2 and 3 and also kept the gold ornaments for hostage. He started harassing her mentally and physically for additional dowry. He used to chat with other girls in dating websites. The accused no.1 harassing the informant to bring additional dowry of Rs.30,00,000/-, his family members also i.e., accused nos.2 to 4 also harassing the informant to support the accused no.1. She informed her parents and brought nearly Rs.4,00,000/- to her parents to solver their problems, but the accused no.1 wasted the money. On 15.07.2020 at 1:00 PM, he intimidated the informant by pressing her neck to bring additional dowry of Rs.30,00,000/-, being she fell unconscious. The sister of accused no.1 i.e., accused no.4 came to their house and beat the informant without consoling. On 30.07.2020 accused no.1 sent the informant out of house to bring money. She came to her parent's house. Accused nos.1 to 3 harassed the informant mentally and physically and beat her. Later, she gave report to the police against the accused.

3. Basing on the report given by L.W.1, L.W.8 namely P.S.V.Subramanyam, Sub Inspector of Police, Gudivada I Town Police station registered the same as case in Crime No.331/2020 of Gudivada I Town Police

station for the offences under Sections 498-A of IPC and Sec.3 & 4 of D.P.Act and investigated into.

4. During the course of the investigation officer secured the presence L.W.1 to L.W.5 namely Shaik Shehanaz, Shaik Abdul Kalam, Shaik Muntaz begum, Shaik Hussain Shareef, Shaik Mehabbob Subhani and recorded their statement under 161(3) Criminal Procedure Code (in short Cr.P.C.).

5. On 27.11.2020, the accused no.1 came to the police station surrendered before LW.8. He served Section 41(A) of the Cr.P.C notices to the accused nos.1 to 4 directed them to appear before the Court.

6. After completion of investigation L.W.8/Sub Inspector of Police filed charge sheet under 173(2) Cr.P.C. against the accused for the offence punishable under Section 498-A of IPC and Sec.3 & 4 of D.P.Act.

7. This Court took cognizance under section 190(1) (b) Cr.P.C against the accused for the offence punishable under Sections 498-A of IPC and Sec.3 & 4 of D.P.Act.

8. On appearance of accused nos.1 to 4, case copies were furnished to them as required under Section 207 Cr.P.C.

9. The accused nos.1 to 4 were examined under Section 239 Cr.P.C. Charges were framed against them for the offences punishable under Section 498-A of IPC and Sec.3 & 4 of D.P.Act and same were read over and explained to the accused in Telugu and the accused denied the accusation made against them and pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried.

10. During the course of trial, on behalf of prosecution, P.W.1 to P.W.6 were examined and got marked Ex.P.1 to Ex.P.4. The learned Assistant Public Prosecutor has not choose to examine L.Ws.3,4, 6, 7 and 9 namely Shaik Muntaz Begum, Shaik Hussain Shareef, Shaik Hussain Peera,

Shaik Dawood, P.Suresh, Sub Inspector of Police, Gudivada I Town P.S. Prosecution evidence is closed.

11. After completion of the evidence for prosecution, the accused nos.1 to 4 examined under section 313 Cr.P.C and all incriminating evidence appearing against them from the evidence of the prosecution witnesses were read over and explained to them in Telugu. The accused denied and refused the correctness of incriminating circumstances with which they were confronted. However, the accused nos.1 to 4 did not adduce any evidence, on their behalf.

12. Heard the learned Assistant Public Prosecutor and learned legal aid counsel for the accused and perused the record.

13. **Now the points for determination are:-**

Whether the prosecution has established the suit of the accused beyond all reasonable doubt for charge punishable under section 498-A of IPC and Sec.3 & 4 of D.P.Act beyond all reasonable doubt?

14. The learned Assistant Public Prosecutor argued that the evidence Pws.1 to 4 and Exs.P1 and P.2 proved the case of the prosecution and prayed to convict the accused as per law.

15. The learned defence counsel argued that accused never harassed PW.1 to bring additional dowry from her parents. P.W.1 foisted this false case against the accused nos.1 to 4, she was accustomed to luxurious life and P.W.1 herself left the company of accused no.1 and went away to her parent's house. He further argued that the evidence of P.W.1 is not corroborating with the evidence of Pws.2 and 3 with regard to presentation of the alleged dowry to accused nos.1 to 4 at the time of marriage of P.W.1. even Pws.2 and 3 have not personally witnessed when accused no.1 harassed P.W.1 by demanding to bring additional dowry from her parents. They stated that they only came to know the said fact through P.W.1. He further argued that the evidence of P.Ws.2 and 3 is not corroborating with the evidence of

P.W.1 and P.W.1 and P.W.2 not mention who are mediators they send to accused house with regard to the alleged mediation in between P.W.1 and accused nos.1 to 4 as P.W.2 stated that even though they admonished the accused, they refused to allow their house to P.W.1 for marital life. P.Ws.1 and 2 never stated the names of the mediators either in Ex.P.1 report or in her evidence and the eye witness to the case of the prosecution. So many doubts arose in the entire version of the case and prayed to acquit the accused on benefit of accused.

16.POINT:-

Heard and perused the record, this court carefully scrutinized the oral and documentary evidence apart from giving anxious consideration to the rival contentions.

17. It is an admitted fact that accused no.1 is the husband and accused nos.2 to 4 are the in-laws of P.W.1. It is also admitted fact tht the marriage of P.W.1 was performed on 14.05.2017 with accused no.1 at officer's club of Gudivada as per Muslim rites and customs. Immediately, at the marriage P.W.1 joined with accused no.1 at her in-laws house at Rajmundry. Later after some days accused no.1, P.W.1 and their family at Hyderabad due to the reason accused no.1 working at Hyderabad and they lived happily for some period. During their wedlock, they not blessed with children. It is the case of prosecution that after one and half year of the marriage. Accused no.1 harassed P.W.1 both physically and mentally with demand to bring additional dowry from her parents on the instigation of accused nos.2 to 4. P.W.1 came to her parents house.

18. In order to prove it case, the Prosecution has to establish the ingredients under section 498A of IPC. Section 498-A of IPC is extracted here under:

“whoever, bring the husband or the relative of the husband subjects his wife to cruelty, he shall be punished with imprisonment for a form which may extend to three years and shall also liable to fine”.

Explanation:- For the purpose of this section “Cruelty means(a) any wilful conduct which is of such a nature as it likely to drive the woman to commit suicide or to cause grievous injury or danger to life, limb or health (whether mental or physical) of the woman; or (b) harassment of the women, 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 an account of failure by her or any person related to her to meet such demand.

19. It is clearly from the language of section 498-A that if a husband or relative of the husband subjects his wife to cruelty, he shall to punishable. The explanation under section 498A of IPC defines cruelty for the purpose of section 498A of IPC to meet any of the acts mentioned in clause(a) or clause(b).

20. The first limb of clause-a of the explanation of sec 498-A of IPC states that cruelty means any willful conduct which is of such a nature as is likely to drive the woman to commit suicide. The second limb of clause b of the said proviso shows any harassment of women in respect of any unlawful demand for any property of the valuable security amounts to cruelty. Therefore to prove the charge under section 498-A of IPC the prosecution is required to prove cruelty as defined either first or second limb of (Clause a or clause b) of the explanation of sec 498-A of IPC.

21. Here in the instant case, P.W.1 deposed contra to her 161 Cr.P.C. statement that after some period of their marriage, accused no.1 used to beat P.W.1 by demanding to bring additional dowry from her parents and due to which she went to her parents house. P.W.1 deposed that the accused no.1 on 15.07.2020 harassed P.W.1 for bring additional dowry of Rs.30,00,000/- and strangled P.W.1 and on the encouraged of accused no.4, the accused no.1 always used beat to P.W.1 and on 30.07.2020 her husband necked out from his house on the demand of additional dowry, if she will not bring as he demanded amount he will marry another women and they will give

Rs.50,00,000/- as dowry and same was expressed to her in inlaws and they were also supported him and advise her to follow his son words. On that, she gave Ex.P.1 report to police. As can be seen from Ex.P.1 report where in P.W.1 stated after some period their marriage accused no.1 addicted gambling, online gaming and chatting with call girl on online App and used to beat P.W.1 and used to harass her both physically and mentally without looking after her welfare at the instigation of accused nos.2 to 4. Further all the accused demand P.W.1 to bring additional dowry from her parents and they also threatened P.W.1 that if she failed to bring additional dowry as demanded by them, they will perform the marriage of accused no.1 with another women. But the same was not deposed in her evidence before this court. She simply deposed she do not know whether she mentioned in her Ex.P.1 and 161 Cr.P.C statement.

23. Further P.W.1 stated that the parents of P.W.1 gave an amount of Rs.10,00,000/- and gold ornament to the accused at the time of marriage to the accused nos.2 to 3. P.W.2 who is the father stated contra to the evidence of P.W.1 that accused nos.1 to 4 demanded Rs.12,00,000/- towards dowry but he gave only Rs.10,00,000/-, gold ornaments to P.W.1 and accused no.1, Rs.1,50,000/- towards saresamans and Rs.90,000/- towards purchase of bike to accused no.1 and they presented in the presence of elders. But P.Ws.1 and 2 categorically deposed that there is no documentary proof to show that P.W.2 gave Rs.10,00,000/-, gold articles, Rs.1,50,000/- and Rs.90,000/- to P.W.1 and accused no.1 in Nikhanagam. But the prosecution examined P.W.3 he is one elder of marriage, P.W.3 stated contra that he was not personally witness when P.W.2 gave an amount of Rs.10,00,000/-, gold articles to P.W.1 and accused no.1, Rs.1,50,000/- towards saresaman and Rs.90,000/- for purchase of bike to accused no.1 at the time of marriage in his presence. But here P.W.3 stated that he came to know all the thing through P.W.2. P.W.3 in his co-ration dealer, as evidence of P.W.3 is the vital point involved in the case

could, but he categorically deposed that he is not eye witness to dowry and all these thing. So nothing elicited from the evidence of P.W.3. Moreover P.W.1 and P.W.2 were admitted there is no documentary proof to show they gave all thing to accused nos.2 and 3 in the presence of elders. But here accused nos.1 to 4 submitted document in form of Ex.D.1 and D.2 as they were presented gold articles to P.W.1 and her brother through Exs.D.1 and D.2 and moreover P.W.1 and P.W.2 admitted at the time of marriage the accused family gave Rs.5,500/- towards Mehar and same was mention in book as per their custom. So as per evidence of P.W.1 and P.W.2 nothing was elicited as they gave dowry and other lanchans at the time of P.W.1 marriage to accused family.

24. Further it is silent in the entire case of the prosecution that when accused nos.1 to 4 harassed P.W.1 to bring additional dowry from her parents, she simply stated on the accused no.1 harassed P.W.1 for bring additional dowry of Rs.30,00,000/- otherwise he will give divorce from P.W.1 and beat P.W.1. As per P.W.2 he deposed that her brother obtain loan from bank and gave Rs.4,00,000/- and some time the accused family see very well for some time, then again started harassed P.W.1 to bring additional dowry, but at the same time in her cross-examination P.W.1 categorically deposed that she do not know same was mention in her Ex.P.1 and 161 Cr.P.C statement, and as per evidence of P.W.2 categorically deposed in cross-examination there is no documentary proof to show that they gave Rs.4,00,000/- towards additional dowry to accused no.1 by taking loan by his son. As per contention of accused they have no need to demand additional dowry and accused nos.1 to 4 submitted the documents to proof that bank statement i.e., joint account of P.W.1 and accused no.1, at the time of retirement accused no.2 deposited Rs.2,00,000/- and every month he send Rs.15,000/- to their account through bank transaction. The same was admitted by P.W.1 in her cross-examination. Another contention of P.W.2 kept dispute before elders when accused no.1

harassed for additional dowry and they conducted mediation, but here P.W.3 who is elder deposed contra, he did not conduct any mediation and he was not eye witness and he came to know through P.W.2. So this part of evidence creating suspicious over the case of prosecution with regard to admonishing of accused nos.1 to 4 take back P.W.1 for matrimonial life and to look after the welfare of P.W.1.

25. Further here in this case there is no clarity in the evidence of prosecution witness that when the accused no.1 beat P.W.1 by demanding to bring additional dowry, but P.W.1 deposed that on 15.07.2020, the accused no.1 harassed to bring additional dowry and he strangled her throat at that time accused no.4 encourage him but here the P.W.1 never gave any report against accused nos.1 to 4 at Hyderabad and same is admitted by her cross-examination and again stated that on 30.07.2020, accused no.1 harassed P.W.1 and neck out his house and no any way she came to her parents house Gudivada. But here as per evidence of P.W.4, he stated that on 23.10.2020 he received Ex.P.2, he examined P.Ws.2 and 3 and list of witness at Gudivada and served 41-A Cr.P.C notice to accused, he laid charge sheet against the accused. But he categorically stated that there is three months delay in giving Ex.P.1 report to the police, but in cross-examination P.W.1 admitted that there is three months delay for filing of Ex.P.1. No explanation was given by P.W.1 and P.W.4.

26. P.W.1 simply say that on 23.10.2020 his brother came Rajahmundry there the accused nos.1 to 4 beat her brother, on that they call 100 thus on they gave complaint against them. But at the same time she admitted there is no documentary proof to show that same. Here there is doubt arise whether the dispute arose on 23.10.2020 as said P.W.1 why either P.W.1 and her parent did not gave any report before police at Rajhamundry or on 15.07.2020 and 30.07.2020 at Hyderabad. P.W.1 and P.W.2 admitted that

they did not gave any report against them in any police station at Hyderabad and Rajahmundry.

27. Here in this aspect the accused relied upon a judgment i.e., **State of Andhra Pradesh V/s M.Madhishah Rao 2008 law suit(SC)1561**, this court relied upon this judgment and also this court further relied upon the decision between. **Ramaiah @ Rama Vs.State of Karnataka reported in 2015(1) ALD Crl.196(SC)**, The Hon'ble Apex Court held in para no.28 is that :

*"We may hasten to add here that may time in such type of cases there can be reason for keeping quite at the given time and not reporting the matter immediately. Therefore we are conscious of legal position that delay per scene of offence may not render prosecution case doubtful as there may be various reason for lodging the FIR with some delay(See **Sahebro cand another Vs. State of Maharastra (2006) 9SCC 794 = AIR 2006 SC 2002=2006 AIR SCC 2490**). Thus there is no hand and rule that any delay in lodging the FIR would automatically render the prosecution case doubtful. However what is emphasized is that if that was so. It was necessary for the prosecution to at least come forward with explanation as to why complainant kept quite and when he did not report the matter to the police immediately. No such explanation is coming forward in the present case. Moreover, in the instant case, the delay is such as fatal when examined in juxtaposition with other material that has come on record and discussed above which shakes the veracity of prosecution case bring it within the four corners of doubtful prosecution story.*

28. There is no hand and fast rule that any delay in lodging the FIR would automatically render the prosecution case as doubtful. However what is emphasized is that if that was so. It was necessary for the prosecution to at least come forward with the explanation as to why the P.W.1 kept quite and why she did not report the matter to the police immediately. No such explantion is came forward in the present case either by P.W.1 or by P.W.4 about the delay of three months in giving Ex.P.1 report to the P.W.4. As such it is fatal to the case of the prosecution.

29. As per the charge sheet the alleged occurrence was happened at the house of accused no.1 at Hyderabad. But P.W.4 admitted that he did not examined any witness at Hyderabad and Rajhundry at her in-laws house. Further P.W.1 and P.W.3 stated that the alleged occurrence happened at accused no.1 house at Hyderabad and inlaw's house at Rajhundry. But P.W.1 and P.W.2 stated since 30.07.2020 P.W.1 residing at P.W.2 house in Gudivada. So there is a variation about the place of occurrence. So shifting of the scene of offence from one place to another place is fatal to the case of the prosecution. Here P.W.1 and P.W.2 categorically admitted that the accused nos.1 to 4 never came to Gudivada after P.W.1 came out her in laws house. So there is no evidence on behalf of the prosecution about the continuous cruelty of P.W.1 by accused nos.1 to 4 and persistency at least close proximity of the lodging complaint.

30. Another content of P.W.1 and P.W.2 that the accused no.1 used contra pills not to confirm pregnancy to P.W.1. But here P.W.1 and P.W.2 their cross-examination they deposed that there is no documentary proof to show as per their contention. But same time accused submitted document with regard to the accused no.1 and P.W.1 under treatment both P.W.1 and accused no.1 for confirming pregnancy to P.W.1. As per document submitted by the accused, this court gone through all the document carefully and it reveals that as P.W.1 having some problem in Utrus i.e., PCOD due to that P.W.1 under went treatment for regularize her period and at the same time both took treatment both confirm for pregnancy. So as per documentary evidence it is clearly shows that the version of P.W.1 and P.W.2 creates doubts, moreover about using of contra **spetivepills** by accused no.1. So the evidence of P.W.1 and P.W.2 nothing elicited the prosecution by said fact.

31. As per the evidence of P.w.1 accused no.1 used to harass P.W.1 at the instigation of accused nos.2 to 4 by demanding bring additional dowry. But they admitted that P.W.1 and accused no.1 never used to reside with accused

nos.2 to 4. Even P.W.3 also not personal witness when accused nos.1 to 4 harassing P.W.1. So there is no consistency in the evidence of P.W.1 with regard to the case of the alleged harassment. In the evidence the prosecution witness and creating doubt over the case of the prosecution. Further the evidence of P.W.1 is in two folds with regard to the cause of harassment and not consistent with the version of the prosecution case and creating doubt. Certainly the doubt must be extended to accused nos.1 to 4 the charge punishable under section 498-A of IPC.

32. With regard to the prosecution of alleged dowry is concerned P.W.1 stated that in elder presence her father all prosecution but P.W.1 and P.W.2 categorically admitted that there is no documentary proof to show that they presented at the time of marriage of accused nos.1 to 4. Even P.Ws.1 and 2 had not mentioned the description of the gold ornaments allegedly presented to accused no.1 in Ex.P.1 report. They did not time any receipt to show that they presented gold ornament to P.W.1 and accused no.1 jointly at the time of marriage. Moreover P.W.1 admitted that accused no.1 purchase house hold articles by obtained Bajaj finance. Even the investigation officer has not seized any incriminating material against the accused nos.1 to 4 with regard to the presentation of the alleged dowry to them by the parents of the P.W.1 at the time of marriage and also demanding of P.W.1 to bring additional dowry from her parents. So many doubts arose in the entire version of the prosecution case and certainly the doubt must be extended to accused nos.1 to 4 for the said charge punishable under section 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act.

33. In view of the aforesaid circumstances, this court is the opinion that prosecution miserably failed to bring home the guilt of the accused for the charge punishable under section 498-A of IPC beyond reasonable doubt. As such the benefit of doubt is given to the accused for the said charge. Accordingly, this point answered in favour of the accused against the prosecution.

34. IN THE RESULT, accused nos. 1 to 4 are ***found not guilty*** under Section 248 (1) Cr.P.C., for the offences punishable Under Section **498-A of the I.P.C and Section 3 & 4 of D.P.Act** and they are *acquitted* for the said offences. The bail bonds of accused nos.1 to 4 shall be remain in force for a period of six months each as per Section 437-A of Cr.P.C. As per chargesheet no property was shown, hence no order as to the property.

Typed to my dictation by the Stenographer, corrected and pronounced by me in Open Court, on this the 24th day of March, 2026.

sd/-Ms.D.Arundhati

**Additional Judicial Magistrate of First Class,
GUDIVADA.**

Appendix of Evidence

Witnesses examined

On behalf of prosecution	On behalf of accused
1. PW.1: Shaik Shehanaz(Defacto complainant)	... NIL...
2. PW.2: Shaik Abdul Kalam(Father of the defacto complainant)	
3. PW.3: Shaik Mehaboob Subhani(witness)	
4. PW.4: P.S.V.Subrahmanyam(Investigating officer)	

Exhibits marked

For Prosecution

1. Ex.P1: Complaint of PW.1 to the police .
2. Ex.P2: First Information Report

For Defence -Nil

Material Objects marked: ... NIL ...

sd/-Ms.D.Arundhati

**Additional Judicial Magistrate of First Class,
GUDIVADA.**

//True copy//

AJMFC,GDV

CALENDAR AND JUDGMENT**CALENDAR CASE NO.774/2021****IN THE COURT OF THE ADDITIONAL JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE OF FIRST CLASS : GUDIVADA:**

1. Date of Offence :: Prior to 22.11.2020
2. Date of Report/Complaint :: 22.11.2020
3. Date of Apprehension :: --
4. Date of Release :: --
5. Commencement of trial :: 23.01.2023
6. Date of Closure of trial :: 10.02.2026
7. Date of Judgment :: 24.03.2026
8. Name of the Complainant :: The State Represented by the Sub Inspector of Police, Gudivada I Town Police Station.
9. Name of the Accused :: 1.Mohammad Shershabdar Ali, S/o Ashraf Ali, aged 33 years,
2. Mohammed Ashraf Ali, S/o Mohammad Sher Ali, aged about 64 years,
3. Meharunnisa, W/o Ashraf Ali, aged about 55 years,
4. Afzalunnisa, D/o Ashraf Ali, aged about 39 years,
all are R/o Dhanavayipeta, Rajahmundry
10. Section of Law :: Sec.498-A r/w 34 of IPC and section 3 & 4 of D.P.Act.
11. Plea of Accused :: Pleaded Not guilty.
12. Finding of the court :: **Found not guilty.**
13. **Result:** IN THE RESULT, accused nos. 1 to 4 are ***found not guilty*** under Section 248 (1) Cr.P.C., for the offences punishable Under Section **498-**

A of the I.P.C and Section 3 & 4 of D.P.Act and they are *acquitted* for the said offences. The bail bonds of accused nos.1 to 4 shall be remain in force for a period of six months each as per Section 437-A of Cr.P.C. As per chargesheet no property was shown, hence no order as to the property.

14. **Explanation for Delay:** This case was taken on file under Section 420, 498-A of the I.P.C and Section 3 & 4 of D.P.Act. and numbered as C.C.774/2021. On 05.10.2021 copies of documents were furnished to the accused and they were examined under Section 239 of Cr.P.C 07.12.2022. On 23.01.2023, the trial commenced in this case and closed on 10.02.2026. The examination of accused under section 313 Cr.P.C on 16.02.2026. Heard arguments on 02.03.2026 and Judgment pronounced on 24.03.2026 Hence the delay.

sd/-Ms.D.Arundhati

**Additional Judicial Magistrate of First Class,
Gudivada.**

Copy submitted to:-

The Hon'ble I Additional Sessions Judge, Machilipatnam.

//True copy//

AJMFC,GDV

IN THE RESULT, accused nos. 1 to 4 are ***found not guilty*** under Section 248 (1) Cr.P.C., for the offences punishable Under Section **498-A of the I.P.C and Section 3 & 4 of D.P.Act** and they are *acquitted* for the said offences. The bail bonds of accused nos.1 to 4 shall be remain in force for a period of six months each as per Section 437-A of Cr.P.C. As per chargesheet no property was shown, hence no order as to the property.