

**IN THE COURT OF THE XVI ADDITIONAL JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE OF
FIRST CLASS, AT IBRAHIMPATNAM, RANGA REDDY DISTRICT**

(Friday, this the 24th day of October, 2025)

PRESENT: Smt. Mudavath Himabindu,
XVI Addl. Judicial Magistrate of First Class,
At Ibrahimpatnam, Ranga Reddy District.

Calendar Case No. 209 of 2019

Between:

The State of Telangana through
The Sub-Inspector of Police, Yacharam.

...Complainant

AND

Ravula Ramesh S/o. R. Naarayana, age: 31 years, Occ: Driving,
R/o. Mall Village, Yacharam Mandal, Ranga Reddy District.

...Accused

This case came before this court for final hearing in the presence of Smt. G. Aruna, Learned Assistant Public Prosecutor for prosecution and Mr. S. Jaipal, Learned Counsel for Accused and having learned and considered the record till date, this court delivered the following.

:: J U D G M E N T ::

1. The Sub-Inspector of Police, Yacharam Police Station filed a charge sheet in Crime No. 23 of 2019 against the Accused for the offences punishable under Section 498-A, 323, 506 of Indian Penal Code and Section 3 and 4 of DP Act.

2. The brief facts of the case are as follows:

On 02.02.2019 at 19:30 hours, LW12/Mr. M. Madhu Kumar, Inspector of Police, Yacharam Police Station received complaint from the complainant/victim Smt. Ravula Shalini, in which she stated that on 29.01.2009 her marriage performed with

XVI AJMFC

Ravula Ramesh S/o. R. Narayana, age: 35 yrs, in the presence of elders at the time of marriage her parents gave Goodes (marriage gifts) Rs.3,00,000/- cash and 2 thulas gold in the presence of caste elders after her marriage her husband harassed her physically and mentally for want of additional dowry and he suspect the complainant who talk with any one relations and neighbors, after her marriage her husband daily consuming alcohol and beat the complainant every day and abusing her in filthy language on 31.01.2019 at about 23:30 hrs her husband consuming alcohol and beat the complainant with hands and abusing her and threaten the complainant, due to harassment of her husband the complainant aversion on her life on 01.02.2019 at about 1300 hrs at the time of no one at home she found the expired tablets in her home and swallow the expired tablets and she got unconscious condition. On information, her relatives shifted her to Amma Hospital Hasthinapuram for treatment and they having two children and she informed reason of delay of complaint she received treatment in hospital today came to PS. Hence, requested to take necessary action.

3. Basing on the contents of complaint LW12/Mr. M. Madhu Kumar, Inspector of Police, Yacharam, registered a case in Crime No. 23 of 2019 under Section 498-A, 323, 506 of IPC and Section 3 and 4 of DP Act and entrusted investigation to LW13.

4. During the course of investigation, the investigating officer has examined the material witnesses and issued notice U/Sec. 41-A Cr.P.C to the accused and filed charge sheet against the accused.

5. The case was taken on file for the offence punishable under Section 498-A, 323, 506 of IPC and Section 3 and 4 of DP Act against the accused and numbered as Calendar Case Number 209/2019.

6. On appearance of accused, copies of documents were furnished to him as contemplated under Section 207 of Code of Criminal Procedure.

7. Accused was examined under Section 239 of Code of Criminal Procedure explaining the substance of accusation levelled against them. Charge was framed for the offences under Section 498-A, 323, 506 of IPC and Section 3 and 4 of DP Act, for which he pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried.

8. During the trial proceedings PW1 to PW7 were examined i.e., LW1 was examined as PW1, LW2 was examined as PW2, LW3 was examined as PW3, LW8 was examined as PW4, LW9 was examined as PW5, LW11 was examined as PW6 and LW13 was examined as PW7 and Exhibits P1 to P6 were marked for prosecution and

the evidence of remaining witnesses were closed by this court. On the other hand, none were examined on behalf of the accused and no documents were marked in support of their contention.

9. After closure of the prosecution evidence, the accused was examined under Section 313 of Code of Criminal Procedure with reference to the incriminating material available against him in the evidence of prosecution witnesses.

10. Heard both sides. Perused the record.

11. The party argued in place of the prosecution that based on the case of the prosecution and the evidence of prosecution witnesses, coupled with documents exhibited through witnesses, the accused has committed the offence Section 498-A, 323, 506 of IPC and Section 3 and 4 of DP Act, as such, he is liable for punishment of the said offence.

12. The learned counsel for the accused argued that the accused is falsely implicated in the above case and he is innocent. It is further submitted that prosecution utterly failed to prove the guilt of the accused beyond all reasonable doubt and as such, the accused is entitled for acquittal.

13. This case arises from a complaint lodged by the complainant, PW1, against her husband, the accused, alleging mental and physical harassment, demand for dowry, and intimidation. The offences are registered under Sections 498A, 323, 506 IPC and Sections 3 & 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961. The marriage between PW1 and the accused was solemnized on 29.11.2009 at Mall. At the time of marriage, dowry comprising Rs.3,00,000/- in cash, two thulas of gold, and household articles was given on demand. Post-marriage, PW1 alleged that the accused suspected her fidelity, subjected her to verbal and physical abuse, and demanded an additional dowry of Rs.1,00,000/- allegedly to travel to Saudi Arabia. Due to the continuous harassment, PW1 attempted suicide by consuming expired tablets on 01.02.2019. She was admitted to Amma Hospital, Hastinapuram for one day, and lodged her complaint on 02.02.2019 (Exhibit P1). The FIR is marked as Exhibit P5, MLC as Exhibit P4, complaint as Exhibit P1, 161 CrPC statement as Exhibit P2, scene of offence panchnama as Exhibit P6, and rough sketch as Exhibit P7.

14. POINT:

The following points are framed to adjudicate the case:

1. *Whether the accused subjected PW1 to cruelty by physical and mental harassment, including dowry-related harassment, punishable under Section 498A IPC?*

2. *Whether the accused voluntarily caused hurt to PW1, punishable under Section 323 IPC?*
3. *Whether the accused criminally intimidated PW1 by threatening her to extract dowry, punishable under Section 506 IPC?*
4. *Whether the accused demanded dowry, in violation of Sections 3 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961?*
5. *Whether the accused demanded dowry, in violation of Section 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961?*
6. *To what relief?*

15. As stated supra, in order to support its case, the prosecution has examined 7 witnesses i.e., PW1 to PW7 and 6 documents got marked as Exhibits P1 to P6. On the other hand, none were examined on behalf of the accused persons and no documents were marked in support of their contention. Hence, the evidence of PWs 1 to 7 stands for scrutiny.

15.1. Out of the witnesses examined by the Prosecution, PW1 is the complainant/victim, PW2 is the mother of the victim, PW3 is the father of the victim, PW4 is the witness, PW5 is the panch witness for scene of offence, PW6 is the one who treated the victim and PW7 is the Investigating Officer and filed charge-sheet.

15.2. To prove the allegations levelled against the accused first of all complainant was called by prosecution and examined as PW1. She deposed that Accused is my husband. My marriage was performed with accused on 29-11-2009 at Mall. At the time of my marriage Rs.300000/- cash and two thulas gold and other house hold

articles were given as dowry to the accused on his demand. After her marriage, she joined the society of accused at Mall. Within one month of their marriage accused started suspecting her character and demanded additional dowry of Rs.1,00,000/- to go Saudi. In this connection, he used to beat and abuse her. They were blessed with a son and a daughter. The matter was placed before village elders but he does not change his behavior. He continued suspecting her. When it became unbearable for him, he attempted suicide by consuming expired tablets on 01.02.2019. He was shifted to Amma hospital, Hastinapuram. On 02.02.2019, during night hours, she filed complaint as she was undergoing treatment in the hospital. Police examined her.

During her cross-examination, she deposed that she studied upto 10th class. Her complaint was scribed by one lady constable on her instructions. Her husband work as car driver. She admitted that for the purpose of car driving her husband went to Dubai. He went to Dubai twice. She cannot say the exact years in which he went to Dubai. She returned within 6 months after his first visit to the Dubai and returned after one year after his second visit to Dubai. The date of birth of her son is 15.01.2011 and daughter's is 24.05.2013. Her father sells utensils. She got treated in the hospital for one day after attempting suicide. She got admitted in the hospital 02.02.2019. Witness adds that the date which she mentioned i.e., 02.02.2019 was the discharge from the hospital. She got discharge at about 6:00 pm. From the hospital she went to the police

station directly, after discharge. She admitted that she filed civil case with respect to the land in Devarakonda Court against the accused. She admitted that she has filed one DVC case in Rajendranagar Court. She does not know who told to her relatives about committing suicide as she fell unconscious immediately after taking tablets. She admitted that her husband used to send the amount every month when he residing in Dubai. Witness adds that he used to send that amount for chits. School fees and house expenses and he send that amount after asking so many times. She denied that her father is not having capacity to give dowry of Rs. 3,00,000/- and 2 tulas gold. Witness adds that her father obtained hand loan from other persons and gave that amount and gold to the accused on demanding. She does not tell before police, in her 161 Cr.P.C. statement and in her chief affidavit as no one asked about the source of amount. She does not have any documentary proof, but the said amount and gold was she does not want to compromise at present though given in presence of elders. She does not want to compromise at present though he is ready to take her. Witness adds that since from 7 years she is facing so many hurdles with her children and till now he does not give single rupee for them and she also attempted suicide by his harassment. She denied that she gave the amount to her parents when her husband sent from Dubai. Witness adds that the amount send by her husband are not sufficient for house expenses. She denied that her father does not have capacity to give the dowry amount and gold as

stated above and she filed false case against her husband/accused to extract money from him. Witness adds that the accused though he taken dowry amount and also harassed her for additional dowry. Her statement was recorded by police by examining her on 02.02.2019 in between 7:00 to 7:30 pm. She denied that she filed land case in Devarakonda for extracting money from her husband. She denied that she filed false cases against her husband in the name of DVC and the present case.

15.3. PW2, who is the mother of the victim deposed that PW1 is her daughter. The marriage of her daughter was performed about 16 years back with one Ravula Ramesh at Vegetable market yard, Mall. They gave Rs. 3,00,000/- and 2 tulas gold as dowry and also kept utensils at the time of marriage. After the marriage her daughter joined the society of her husband in Mall village. They lived happily for two months after the marriage and from then he started harassing her daughters by taking alcohol and also harassed for additional dowry. He was informed by her daughter that her husband harassing her for every issue and abusing her in filthy language after taking alcohol. On her information they approached their relatives and conducted panchayath with the accused and after that he assured them he will change and he will take care of her daughter. But, on one day she received a phone call from her daughter stating that her son-in-law is again harassing her for additional dowry and not allowing to talk with any one and also told that she will commit suicide due to the harassing causing by her

son-in-law. Later, she came to know that she had taken some tablets to kill herself and she was admitted in the hospital by her mother-in-law and sister-in-law and also informed them about that, then immediately, they went to the hospital. After discharging her daughter from the hospital, they went to police station along with her and lodged complaint. Complaint was given by her before the Assistant Sub-Inspector of Police. Police examined her and recorded her statement.

During her cross-examination, she deposed that she does not remember the exact date on which she gave complaint in the police station may be it is on 3rd date. They lodge complaint in the evening hours may be in between 7:00 to 8:00 pm. She denied that she came to know about committing suicide by her daughter after she was joined in the hospital. Witness adds as she stated above, her daughter already told about committing suicide in a phone call. Her daughter was admitted in the hospital by her mother-in-law and sister-in-law as she stated above. The sister-in-law of her daughter named Manjula informed her about committing suicide by daughter after admitting the hospital. Her husband do utensils business. She stated before the police about informing me about the committing suicide by her daughter, by her sister-in-law. Her daughter took tablets on 2nd and they went to the police station on 3rd. She does not remember the exact dates on which they conducted panchayat before elders, but once the panchayat was conducted immediately, after two months of marriage and again

after 6 to 7 months after giving birth to girl child. She admitted that she mentioned in her complaint about giving dowry of Rs. 3,00,000/- and 2 tulas gold to her son-in-law. She denied that her husband does not have capacity to give said amount and gold. She admitted that a civil case was filed in Devarakonda court with respect to land. It is the wish of her daughter to go with her son-in-law or not and she is no one to involve. She denied that her son in law/accused never harassed her daughter and not demanded additional dowry. She admitted that the accused went to Dubai. He went Dubai immediately after marriage and after giving birth to the son. She denied that her son-in-law used to send amount to her daughter for every month when he was staying at Dubai. Police examined her and recorded her statement on 3rd. She cannot say the month and year as she is illiterate. Her statement was recorded about 6 years back by police in the police station. She denied that her son-in-law never harassed her daughter at any point of time and to extract money and property from him wthey filed this false case against him.

15.4. PW3, who is the father of victim deposed that he know PW1. She is her daughter and PW2 is her wife. The marriage of his daughter was performed 13 years ago and they gave Rs. 3,00,000/-, two thulas gold and also kept Utensils as dowry. Marriage of her daughter was performed in Mall and after the marriage she lived in Mall village by joining the society of her husband. They both lived happily for 5 to 6

months and thereafter, his son-in-law started harassing her. His son-in-law also demanded additional dowry and also asked car. His son-in-law also told that he intended to marry their younger daughter. His son-in-law started suspecting his daughter when his son-in-law resided in Saudi and he does not look after his daughter when he was away from her. His son-in-law used to send the ration to his daughter when she was residing in B.N.Reddy Nagar. They approached their relatives and conducted panchayat with the accused and after that his son-in-law assured the, that he will change and take care of his daughter, but one day she committed suicide by taking some pills to kill herself and got admitted in the hospital. After knowing that they went to the hospital immediately and thereafter went to the police station and lodged complaint. Police examined her and recorded her statement.

During his cross-examination, he deposed that he used to earn Rs. 10,000/- to Rs. 15,000/- per month previously. Witness adds that at present he is a Cancer patient. He admitted that he stated before police while giving his statement that her daughter and son-in-law live happily 5 to 6 months after the marriage. His daughter was having two children i.e., one girl and one boy. He does not remember whether he told to police or not about his daughter staying at B.N. Reddy Nagar. After two years of marriage they went to B.N.Reddy nagar. His daughter is house wife. He does not state before police which he stated in his chief examination about asking car and marrying

his younger daughter by his son-in-law. He cannot say the exact period at which the accused went to Dubai. Previously, he used to drive car and later along with his brother he used to go to Dubai. He admitted that a civil suit filed against the accused for his property in Devarakonda court. He admitted that a DVC case filed against the accused in Rajendranagar court. Witness adds that he know about DVC case, but he does not know about the case filed in Devarakonda. He does not send his daughter along with the accused. Witness adds that again he will harass his daughter. He does not remember the exact date on which his daughter took tablets. He denied that he does not gave dowry as stated in his chief examination. He himself lodged this present complaint before police station, but he does not remember the date on which he lodged complaint. He does not know the date on which his statement was recorded by the police and it is recorded at Yacharam village. He denied that he does not lodged any complaint before police and his statement was recorded by the police.

15.5. PW4, who is the witness deposed that he know PW1 as the wife of the accused. He know accused. He does not know what happened between PW1 and the accused, but at present PW1 is not with the accused. Police did not examine him and not recorded his statement and he resiled from the previous statement and did not support the case of the Prosecution.

During his cross-examination by the learned Assistant Public Prosecutor, he denied that he stated before police as per his 161 Cr.P.C. statement, Ex.P2 is the 161 Cr.P.C. statement of PW1. It is not true to suggest that I am deposing false to help the accused as they both belong to same village. Witness adds that the accused does not stay in the village regularly.

15.6. PW5, who is the panch witness for scene of offence deposed that no panchanama was conducted before him. He went to police station on some other purpose and police obtained his signature and he does not know anything about this case. Witness identified his signature on scene of offence panchanama. Ex.P3 is the signature on scene of offence panchanama and he resiled from the previous statement and did not support the case of the Prosecution.

During his cross-examination by the learned Assistant Public Prosecutor, he denied that police conducted panchanama before him and he is deposing false to help the accused.

15.7. PW6, who is the one who treated the victim deposed that previously, when he was working as General Physician at Amma Hospital, Hasthinapuram, he examined a patient named Ravula Shalini, who was admitted in the hospital by consuming unknown tablets and she was placed in casualty room. She came with drowsiness, but her vitals are stable. Ex.P4 is the MLC issued by PW6.

During his cross-examination, he deposed that the above said patient was admitted in the hospital for one day. She came with only drowsiness, but there is no fever and other concerns. He does not know reasons why she consumed tablets. Police never examined him and not recorded his statement. He denied that the patient admitted in their hospital by consuming tablets and she took heavy dose tablets for fever.

15.8. PW7, who is the Investigating Officer deposed that at present, he is working at Nacharam Police station, Rachakonda. Previously, when he is working as Sub-Inspector of police at Yacharam Police Station, on 02.02.2019 at 19:30 hours, LW12/Madhukumar, Inspector of police received a petition from PW1, basing on the complainant made a GD entry and entrusted investigation to him. During the course of investigation, he examined LW1/R.Shalini to LW8/Gulam Subhani. Thereafter, he visited scene of offence and conducted scene of offence panchanama in the presence of PW5 and LW10/G.Murali. On 04.02.2019, he apprehended the accused and produced before the Ho'ble court and he was sent to judicial custody. Thereafter, he has collected MLC from PW6. After completion of investigation, he filed charge sheet in the court. Ex.P5 is the FIR, Ex.P6 is the scene of offence panchanama, Ex.P7 is the rough sketch.

During his cross-examination, he admitted that LW1/R.Shalini to LW5/K.Pentaiah all are family members. He denied that he does not examine any independent witnesses. He does not produce any documents to support the allegations of dowry demand by the accused. He denied that with the intention to support the case of PW1, he filed charge sheet without any investigation. He denied that the charge sheet was filed without conducting proper investigation and no scene of offence panchanama was conducted and rough sketch was drawn at the scene of offence. He denied that he does not examine any witnesses.

16. Point No. 1:

It is appropriate at this stage to reproduce the legal provisions of Section 498A IPC for proper appreciation of the case.

Section 498A IPC penalizes a husband or his relatives if they subject a woman to cruelty, which includes inflicting physical or mental harassment, particularly in relation to dowry demands. The law recognizes that mental cruelty, if persistent and severe, can be as damaging as physical assault.

17. Coming to the present case, PW1 deposed that immediately after marriage, the accused began to suspect her fidelity without cause, verbally abused her, physically assaulted her, and demanded additional dowry. She stated that the accused repeatedly

beat her and insulted her in front of neighbours and in-laws. PW2 (mother) and PW3 (father) corroborated these statements, testifying that the accused continuously harassed PW1, causing extreme mental distress. The complainant ultimately consumed expired tablets on 01.02.2019 as a result of this sustained harassment, leading to her hospitalization. The medical certificate Ex.P4 confirms her admission for one day due to drowsiness after ingestion of unknown tablets, which is consistent with her version. The complaint lodged by PW1 (Ex.P1) and FIR (Ex.P5) further document the harassment and dowry demands.

The accused did not deny physical abuse or the suicide attempt during cross-examination. Even though neutral witnesses PW4 and PW5 did not substantially support the prosecution, they did not dispute the occurrence of the suicide attempt. During the cross-examination accused counsel only tried to elicit with respect to the capacity to give dowry as alleged but, not denied the suicide attempt and the harassment allegations of the complainant.

PW1 clearly stated in her cross-examination that, her father sold utensils and obtained loans to meet the initial dowry demands, which indicates that the accused demands caused financial burden. Although there is no documentary proof of the additional dowry, oral testimony is supported by medical evidence (Ex.P4). Moreover, as mentioned above, PW1 categorically deposed that her father, who earns his

livelihood by selling utensils, had obtained a loan to meet the dowry demands at the time of her marriage. It is pertinent to note that in such socio-economic backgrounds, it is quite common for the parents of a girl child to secure loans or borrowings to satisfy marriage related expenses. The absence of documentary proof regarding such a loan cannot be treated as fatal to the prosecution case, particularly when the defence has not put any suggestion or denial in the cross-examination of PW1 on this aspect. When the version of PW1 remains uncontroverted, the Court has no reason to disbelieve her testimony, which appears natural, probable, and consistent with the normal human conduct and circumstances prevailing in society.

18. Based on the foregoing discussion of the prosecution evidence, this Court reaches the conclusion that the testimony of PW1, corroborated by her parents and supported by medical evidence and the complaint/FIR, establishes continuous mental and physical harassment. The suicide attempt itself is a direct consequence of the cruelty and constitutes strong proof of severe mental harassment. Hence, the prosecution has proved beyond reasonable doubt that the accused subjected PW1 to cruelty under Section 498A IPC.

Although, as rightly argued by the learned defence counsel, all the prosecution witnesses are related to the complainant and no independent witnesses have been examined, thereby raising doubt about the truthfulness of the prosecution case.

However, it is a well-settled principle in criminal jurisprudence that the evidence of related witnesses cannot be discarded merely on the ground of relationship if their testimony is otherwise cogent, consistent, and trustworthy. The law requires that such evidence be carefully scrutinized but, not rejected outright. Particularly in offences under Section 498-A IPC, it is to be noted that acts of cruelty and harassment usually occur within the four walls of the matrimonial home, away from public view. The pain and agony suffered by a woman are known only to her and, at times, to her immediate family members to whom she confides her suffering. Therefore, the absence of independent witnesses cannot be treated as fatal to the prosecution, wherein it was held in a catena of judgements that in matrimonial offences, it would be unrealistic to expect independent witnesses, and if the evidence of the victim and her close relatives inspires confidence, conviction can safely be based thereon.

19. In the present case, the complainant narrated in a consistent and convincing manner that soon after her marriage, she was subjected to both mental and physical cruelty by the accused for not satisfying the unlawful demands for additional dowry and she also attempted suicide by consuming tablets. Her testimony is corroborated by the statements of her parents, which remain unshaken despite cross-examination. Their testimonies are natural, consistent, and supported by contemporaneous documentary evidence such as the complaint and medical record as stated above. The defence could

not bring out any material contradiction or omission to doubt their veracity. It is further to be noted that the testimony of the victim in cases of this nature carries the same weight as that of an injured witness. The law is well settled that conviction can be based solely on the testimony of the victim if it is credible and trustworthy. Applying that principle, this Court finds the complainant's evidence wholly reliable, consistent, and free from exaggeration.

Under Section 498A IPC, cruelty includes both physical and mental cruelty inflicted with a view to coercing the woman or her relatives to meet unlawful demands for dowry. The continuous harassment, verbal abuse, and physical violence narrated by the complainant clearly amount to cruelty as defined under Explanation (a) and (b) to Section 498A IPC. The nature and pattern of harassment reveal that it was persistent and connected to the demand for additional dowry. Hence, the essential ingredients of Section 498A IPC stand satisfied.

20. Point No. 2 – Voluntarily Causing Hurt under Section 323 IPC

Section 323 IPC punishes anyone who voluntarily causes bodily pain, disease, or infirmity to another person.

PW1 deposed that she was beaten repeatedly by the accused, resulting in bodily pain and mental distress. PW2 and PW3 confirmed the assaults, stating that the

accused used to physically assault PW1 over minor issues and for demanding dowry. Although no independent witness directly observed the assaults, the consistency of testimony between PW1 and her parents, coupled with the medical record (Exhibit P4) confirming that the suicide attempt followed extreme mental distress, indirectly corroborates the physical hurt. The accused did not deny the physical assaults during cross-examination.

Based on the above discussion, it is seen that the repeated physical assaults, even if not witnessed by third parties, constitute voluntarily causing hurt. The combination of physical assault, mental harassment, and resulting distress leading to hospitalization satisfies the ingredients of Section 323 IPC. Hence, the prosecution has proved beyond reasonable doubt that the accused voluntarily caused hurt to PW1, and this point is answered in favour of the prosecution.

21. Point No. 3 – Criminal Intimidation under Section 506 IPC

Section 506 IPC punishes criminal intimidation, defined as threatening a person with injury to their person, property, or reputation with intent to cause fear.

PW1 deposed that the accused demanded an additional dowry of Rs. 1,00,000/- and threatened to harm her if the demand was not met. PW2 and PW3 corroborated that these threats caused fear in PW1 and her family. The complaint (Ex.P1) and FIR

(Ex.P5) specifically record that the accused threatened PW1 to extract additional dowry. The accused did not deny these threats during cross-examination.

Based on the above-discussed evidence, the threats made by the accused to extract dowry, causing fear of harm to PW1, clearly constitute criminal intimidation under Section 506 IPC. The corroboration of these threats in the complaint and FIR supports the prosecution's case. Hence, the prosecution has proved beyond reasonable doubt that the accused criminally intimidated PW1. This point is answered in favour of the prosecution.

22. Point No.4 – Section 3 of Dowry Prohibition Act

It is appropriate at this stage to reproduce the legal provisions of Section 3 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 for proper appreciation of the case.

Sections 3 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 prohibit giving, taking dowry. PW1, PW2, and PW3 consistently deposed that dowry was given at the time of marriage.

The evidence of the complainant and her parents also establishes that the accused demanded and accepted dowry in the form of cash and gold both at the time of marriage and subsequently, but to prove the same petitioner did not file any document before the court.

Hence, upon a careful appreciation of the entire material on record, this Court finds that there is no evidence before the court to support the allegation of the complainant. Therefore, this Court is of the considered opinion that the prosecution is failed to prove this point beyond reasonable doubt that the accused took dowry at the time of marriage as alleged. Accordingly, Point is answered in the negative and the accused is found not guilty for the offence punishable under Section 3 of Dowry Prohibition Act.

23. Point No.5 – Section 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act

It is appropriate at this stage to reproduce the legal provisions of Section 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 for proper appreciation of the case.

Sections 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 prohibit demanding dowry. PW1, PW2, and PW3 consistently deposed that dowry was given at the time of marriage and that additional dowry was demanded later. Exhibit P1 (complaint) and Exhibit P5 (FIR) document the dowry demand. Therefore, this Court is of the considered opinion that the prosecution has successfully proved beyond reasonable doubt that the accused subjected the complainant to cruelty, both physical and mental, in connection with the unlawful demand of dowry, thereby committing the offence punishable under Section 498A IPC, and that the accused also demanded additional dowry, thereby committing

the offences punishable under Section 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961. Accordingly, Point is answered in the affirmative and the accused is found not guilty for the offence punishable under Section 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act.

24. Point No.6 – To What Relief

In view of the above discussion and findings on all the points, this Court concludes that the prosecution has successfully proved all the points framed beyond reasonable doubt. Accordingly, the accused is hereby convicted for the offences punishable under Sections 498A, 323, and 506 of the Indian Penal Code and Sections 3 and 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961.

25. In the result, Accused is found guilty for the offence under section 498-A, 323, 506 of Indian Penal Code and Section 3 and 4 of DP Act and accordingly, he is convicted under Section 248(2) of Cr.P.C for the said offence and the accused is found not guilty for the offence under section Section 3 of DP Act and accordingly, he is acquitted under Section 248(1) of Cr.P.C for the said offence.

Typed by the Stenographer, to my dictation, corrected and pronounced by me in the Open Court on this the 24th day of October, 2025.

**XVI ADDL.JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE OF FIRST CLASS,
IBRAHIMPATNAM, RANGA REDDY DISTRICT.**

XVI AJMFC

Questioning on quantum of Sentence:

1. Heard the accused on the quantum of sentence to be imposed against him. The accused submitted that the accused is the sole breadwinner of the family and he is having two children and that his incarceration will cause hardship to the family. It is also urged that the accused is a first-time offender, has roots in society, and therefore may be treated leniently. In view of the above submissions of the accused considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is the opinion that this is not a fit case to invoke the provisions under Section 360 Cr.P.C., and based on the circumstances of the case, that the accused harassed the complainant physically and mentally for want of additional dowry and he suspects the complainant. But, based on the submissions made by the accused this court sees that the accused is the first time offender and has responsibility for his and this court feel that the prolonged imprisonment may affect the welfare of children. Hence, this court took lenient and passed following sentence.

2. Accordingly, accused is sentenced to undergo Simple Imprisonment for a period of **ONE (01) YEAR** and to pay fine of **Rs. 1,000/- (Rupees One Thousand only)** for the offence punishable **under Section 498-A of Indian Penal Code**. In default of payment of fine he shall undergo simple imprisonment for a period of one month. Further a Simple Imprisonment for a period of **SIX (06) MONTHS** and to pay a fine of **Rs. 1,000/- (Rupees One Thousand only)** for the offence punishable **under Section 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act**. In default of payment of fine he shall undergo simple imprisonment for a period of one month. And to pay a fine of **Rs. 1,000/- (Rupees One Thousand only)** for the offence punishable **under Section 323 of Indian Penal Code**. In default of payment of fine he shall undergo simple imprisonment for a period of one month. And further to pay fine of **Rs. 500/- (Rupees**

Five Hundred only) for the offence punishable **under Section 506 of Indian Penal Code**. In default of payment of fine he shall undergo simple imprisonment for a period of one month. Both sentences shall run concurrently. The remand period undergone by the accused if any shall be set off under Section 428 of Cr.P.C. The accused is informed about his right of appeal against the judgment passed by this court and also he is informed about his right to take legal aid in preferring the appeal.

**XVI ADDL.JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE OF FIRST CLASS,
IBRAHIMPATNAM, RANGA REDDY DISTRICT**

**LIST OF PROSECUTION AND DEFENCE WITNESSES
A-PROSECUTION WITNESSES**

PW1	LW1	Ravula Shalini	Complainant/Victim
PW2	LW2	Katipally Padma	Mother of victim
PW3	LW3	Katipally Jagadeesh	Father of victim
PW4	LW8	Gulam Subhani	Witness
PW5	LW9	Neela Ramesh	Panch witness for scene of offence
PW6	LW11	Dr. Thivikram, General Physician	Who treated the victim
PW7	LW13	Mr.B. Venkataiah, SI of Police	Investigating Officer

B- DEFENCE WITNESSES

-NIL-

XVI AJMFC

LIST OF PROSECUTION AND DEFENCE EXHIBITS**A-PROSECUTION EXHIBITS**

Exhibit.P1/PW1	02.02.2019	Complaint
Exhibit.P2/PW4	03.02.2019	161 Cr.P.C. statement of PW4
Exhibit.P3/PW5	03.02.2019	Signature on scene of offence panchanama
Exhibit.P4/PW6	20.03.2019	MLC
Exhibit.P5/PW7	02.02.2019	First Information Report
Exhibit.P6/PW7	03.02.2019	Scene of offence panchanama
Exhibit.P7/PW7	03.02.2019	Rough Sketch

B-DEFENCE EXHIBITS**-NIL-****MATERIAL OBJECTS MARKED****-NIL-****XVI ADDL. JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE OF FIRST CLASS,
IBRAHIMPATNAM, RANGA REDDY DISTRICT.**

XVI AJMFC