

**IN THE COURT OF THE III-ADDITIONAL JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE OF  
FIRST CLASS, ONGOLE**

Present :- **Smt D.Durga Kalyani**  
III-Addl. Judicial Magistrate of First Class, Ongole

Tuesday, this the 6<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2015

**D.V.C.1/2014**

Between

Gunakala Durga Rani W/o G.Sudhakar, Telaga by caste, Age 38 years,  
D.No.8-165-C, Rajiv Nagar, Lawyer pet, Ongole. **... Complainant**

And

1.Gunakala Sudhakar, S/o Venkata Ramanaiah, D.No.6-202-D, near Anjaneyaswamy temple, 2nd line, Opp. Saraswathi Mandir, Gorantla (Rural), Guntur District

2.Gunakala Venkata Ramanaiah, Retired Superintendent, (R&B), D.No.6-202/3, near Anjaneyaswamy temple, 2nd line, Opp. Saraswathi Mandir, Gorantla (Rural), Guntur District

3.G.Ramatulasamma, W/o Venkata Ramanaiah D.No.6-202/3, near Anjaneyaswamy temple, 2nd line, Opp. Saraswathi Mandir, Gorantla (Rural), Guntur District

4.M.Saraswathi Advocate W/o M.V.Narayana, Plot No.2/03, Vinayaka Hevan Road.No.1, Telephone Colony, Kothapet, Hyderabad.

5.K.Padma, W/o Ankaiah Warden Government Boys Hostel-3, Near Manasa Theater, Kulugolammamet, Kavali.

6.G.Sivarama Murthy S/o G.V.Ramanaiah, Engineer, B.H.P.&V House.No. 7-1-67, Satyaprasad Thota, near Kotak school, China Valter, Vijag.

7.M.V.Narayana Advocate, Plot No.103, Vinayaka Hevan Road, Telephone Colony, Kothapet, Hyderabad-35.

8.Kesamsetty Ankaiah, Warden, Government Boys Hosetl, near Manasa Theater, Kulugolammamet, Kavali, Nellore Districg.

**..... Respondents**

This case coming on 29.12.2014 before me for final hearing in the presence of Sri.V.Ravi Kumar, Advocate for Complainant; and of Sri.B.Lakshmi Narayana, Advocate for Respondents 1 to 8 and having stood over for consideration till this day, this court delivered the following :

**ORDER**

1. The protection Officer/Project Director (District Women and Child Development agency), Ongole has forwarded application to this court comprised in Form No II U/sec.12 of Prevention women DV Act 2005 with a copy of domestic incident report i.e., form No.1 with a written report given to protection Officer by the agreed person that is the

applicant by name G.Durga Rani. The protection officer forwarded a letter to this court praying to pass orders as deemed necessary in the circumstances of the case.

The following claims are prayed by the applicant:

1. To pass protection Orders U/sec.18
2. To pass residence Orders U/sec.19,
3. To grant monitory relief U/sec.20
4. To grant orders U/sec.21
5. To grant compensation U/sec.22

This is a case transferred to this court from Spl. Excise court and renumbered as DVC No.1/2014.

2. Brief facts of the application are as follows:

The aggrieved women i.e., applicant is referred as a petitioner in the following order:

The petitioner herein submits that she was married with the respondent R1 on 9-5-1996 at Ongole as per Hindu Rites and Customs. At the time of marriage her parents presented an amount of Rs.1,95,000/- to the respondents family. After marriage she proceeded to her matrimonial home to lead marital life with the respondents. There upon she was looked well by the respondent's for one year. After that her in-laws, and sister in laws by name M.Satyavathi and K.Padma started harassing the petitioner with abusing words. On that the respondent-R1 used to send the petitioner to her parents house stating that he would take her after disputes are adjusted. When the same was denied by this petitioner her mother-in law and sister in law beat her indiscriminately by locking her in a room. In spite of suggesting them the respondent-R1 also used to support them in beating her. The same was informed to her parents by this petitioner. At that juncture her

brother by name Venkateswara Rao and her mother came to Guntur. Then the respondent-R1 beat her in their presence also. In addition to that her mother in law and sister in laws has necked out her from her matrimonial home. Having no other go she was brought to Ongole by her mother and brother. Later, After attempt of mediation by the parents of petitioner, father in law of this petitioner came to Ongole and took her to Guntur. Subsequently in the year 2001 the respondent resigned his job and started apartment construction business. In that regard the respondent-R1 planned to get rid of this petitioner with the assistance of his brother-in laws and brother by name M.V.Narayana, Kesasmsetty Ankaiah and G.Siva Rama Murthy as he faced business loss. Besides that he also made her mother in law and sister in laws to beat the petitioner and sent her to Ongole in the year 2002. Thereafter he has sent notice in the month of march, 2002. At that juncture again at the instance of elders of petitioner mediation took place where the respondent demanded the parents of the petitioner that he would allow her if 1,50,000/- is paid to him. On that her parents has given Rs1,00,000/- and send the petitioner to her matrimonial home. At that time the respondent has set separate family and again addicted to bad vices like having alcohol. On that he used to h arras the petitioner to give divorce. Meanwhile the petitioner and respondent again went to her mother in laws house and started living there as she fell ill. At that time her mother in law, sister in laws and brother in laws of respondent has made respondent to beat the petitioner stating that she has not given birth to children. So saying they hatched up a plan to get rid of this petitioner. In that regard all of them dropped the petitioner highhandedly in her parents house stating that she has not begotten children. Besides that when she resided in her parents house all of them use to make

phone calls to this petitioner by threatening that they would kill her if she doesn't accept for divorce.

Hence, with the above said submission the applicant conveyed that she has faced severe mental agony and emotional distress due to the cruel acts of respondents and so she filed the present case praying the court to grant the following claims.

1. A protection Order under Sec.18 of the Act
  2. To return the following articles which are in position of respondents I.e. dowry amount, and gold ornaments
  3. Maintenance of Rs. 10,000/-
  4. A compensation order for an amount of Rs.15,00,000/- for mental torture caused by them.
3. On the other hand the respondent NO.1 filed counter with the following facts:

coming to the case of respondent 2 to 5 this case against them is quashed by Hon'ble High Court of A.P. In CrI.Petition Nos.12012 and 12797 of 2012 dt.22-10-2013 & 8-11-2013. The respondent denies the averments of the petition. He submits that originally this respondent is youngest son to his parents and his parents are permanent residents of Gorantla. They are old aged persons where none others are present except this respondent to attend their needs as his brothers are settled at Vizag and Srikakulam by virtue of their employment. He further submits that he is a graduate in Civil Engineering and voluntarily retired from A.P. State Housing Corporation in the year 2001 after the completion of 9 years service due to mental torture met out by this complainant.

4. He submits that on 9-5-1996 his marriage was performed with the petitioner as per Hindu Rites and costumes and immediately after

marriage the petitioner lived with him only for short time I.e. for 3 months in the house of his parents. After marriage he came to know that the petitioner is adamant careless and reckless lady as she used to behave with his parents not ordinary prudent housewife. Further she also not cooperated with him in leading conjugal life. Besides that she used to leave her matrimonial home without intimation to this respondent. After many persuasions she used to return to the house by developing disliking towards this respondent and his parents for no fault on their behalf. She also used to abuse the respondents to the extent of subjecting them to hard words and acts during her short stay of 3 months in his house.

5. It is further submitted by him that on 17-12-1997 as usual she left house with all her belongings without prior permission and intimation to this respondent. After that she did not turn up stating that she is not interested with him. At last, at the request of this respondents father, she attended the 50<sup>th</sup> marriage day celebration of his parents at Gorantla on 19-5-1998. At that time also she resided for 3 weeks and left his house on 21-6-1998 without any reason. So, the respondent again made attempt to get back the petitioner home both personally and through mediators but the petitioner refused to join him without any reason. Thus the petitioner herself deserted the respondent without justifiable ground. At that juncture the respondent wrote number of letters to the petitioner on 22-1-1999 disclosing his views about the relation ship with the petitioner. But petitioner has sent a letter on 29-1-1999 with false allegations showing her disinterest in joining him.

6. It is further submitted by the respondent that in the last week of January 1999 his mother had a mild paralytic stroke and she was admitted in St.Joesphs Hospital, Guntur. After treatment she was

discharged on 5-2-1999. When the said fact was informed to petitioner she did not care to visit the respondents mother. Further on 18-6-1999 this respondents junior paternal uncle was expired at Guntur. The same was telegrammed to the petitioner who did not even turned up at that time also. She also did not attend when this respondent elder sister died insptie of receiving several intimations. Further on 17-12-1999 this respondent met with an accident and admitted in Sai Truma Hospital, at that time she just visited the hospital stayed for one or two hours and went away. This shows that petitioner is not intended and interested in maintaining the relationship with the respondent. Further the petitioner began to work as a teacher without leaving Ongole.

7. Therefore, the respondent patiently waited for a change in the attitude of petitioner but she did not turn up. At that juncture he issued a registered notice dt.19-3-2002 for dissolution of marriage between them as there is no possibility of re-union. Instead of accepting for the said proposals the petitioner got issued reply notice dt. 28-3-2002 with false allegations. He also submits that this case under DVC was filed after filing of HMOP by him in Addl. Senior Civil Judge Court at Guntur. Later the said HMOP was transferred to this Ongole and renumbered as FCOP 76/2011 on the file of family Court, Ongole. As the petitioner deserted the respondent without any justifiable cause in the month of June-1998 he sought for dismissal of the petition.

8. During the course of trial the applicant was examined as P.W1, her brother as P.W2 and one Chennu Venkata Rathaiah as P.W3. No documents were marked in her evidence. After closure of applicants evidence respondent examined himself as R.W1 and one Sambasiva Rao is examined as R.W2, C.Purushotamma Rao is examined as R.W3 and B.Srinivasa Reddy is examined as R.W4.

9. Heard arguments on both sides.
10. Basing on the above pleadings the point for consideration is:
  1. Whether the petitioner for the claims U/sec.18,19,20,21, & 22 of DV Act as pleaded by her?
11. Point :-According to P.W1 it is deposed by her that after marriage she was looked well by the respondents only for one year. Later, her husband and her in laws started harassing for want of additional dowry. In that regard her parents has given Rs.1,00,000/- to the respondents in the year 2002. After that the petitioner and respondent/R1 started residing separately. Again after one year they returned back to her in laws house as her mother in law fell ill. Then again sister in law and her husband started harassing P.W1 to give divorce to R1 for performing 2<sup>nd</sup> marriage to 1<sup>st</sup> respondent as this petitioner had no issues. When she refused to give divorce she was dropped forcibly in her parents house in the month of December 2003.
12. At that juncture she sent her brother Suresh and Chini Venkata Rataiah i.e. P.W3 as mediators to the house of respondent for resolving the dispute. But it was failed. Besides that 1<sup>st</sup> respondent also threatened P.W1 that he would kill her if she attend the court on the aspect of divorce. On that she has filed with case against respondent for the offence punishable U/sec.498-A IPC. Which was registered as a case in Cr.No.209/2010 in Taluq P.S.
13. At present she has no income and she is dependent on her father. Where as her husband is doing construction business and earning an amount of Rs.1,00,000/- and Rs.20,000/- towards rents on the house owned by him. She also deposes that he owned a house worth 1 crore situated at Gorantla of Guntur District. Hence she has filed this petition for want of maintenance of Rs.15,000/- per month, to return her dowry

amount and also the amount given towards house hold articles, gold ornaments and also Rs.15,00,000/- towards compensation for the mental harassment done by him.

14. Corroborating the version of P.W1, P.W2 & 3 being brother and one C.Venkata Rathaiah filed their chief affidavits in lieu of chief examinations averring the same contents in the following manner.

15. That the petitioner was married with the respondent 9-5-1996 as per Hindu Rites and customs. At the time of marriage respondents were paid an amount of Rs.1,95,000/- cash, given 20 sovereigns of gold and Rs.50,000/- towards house hold articles. After marriage she immediately joined the respondent and proceeded to Guntur. Even her marriage was consummated she was not blessed with children. Thereupon the respondents started harassing the petitioner for want of additional dowry. In that regard the respondent oftenly used to send the petitioner to her parents house stating that he would visit her now and then. On one occasion the respondents mother and sister beat P.W1 and confined her in a room with the support of R1. After coming to know about the same P.W2 and mother of petitioner went to Guntur where the respondent also beat the petitioner in their presence and went into the house. Having no other alternative petitioner came to Ongole with her brother and mother as her mother in law and sister in laws drove her from her matrimonial home. Subsequently after attempt of compromise the father in law of petitioner came to Ongole and took her to his house at Guntur.

16. In the year 2001 the respondent left his job and started construction business in Guntur. In the year 2002 he again beat petitioner and send her to Ongole at the instance of his brother in laws. At that juncture this P.W2 and P.W3 held mediation for which the

respondents was paid 150,000/- on his demand and accordingly separately family was set up by him at Guntur. Though, respondent did not change his attitude. In spite of that he was addicted to bad vices and harrassed petitioner to give divorce. Again the respondent shifted house to his parents house and all the respondents threatened the petitioner and dropped her at Ongole stating that they would get huge amount of Rs.5 lakhs towards dowry if R1 is married to another women. At that juncture having no alternative the petitioner filed this complaint after filing police case against the respondents as the petitioner has no means to maintain herself.

17. Per contra the respondent examined as R.W1 and one Sambasiva Rao and C.Puroshothama Rao are examined as R.W2 & 3. He also summoned bank manager B.Srinivasa Rao and examined him on his behalf as R.W4. Ex.R1 to R5 are exhibited in his evidence.

18. The contention of respondent as R.W1 is as follows:

He deposes that after marriage he set a family at Nagaralu village in a rented house. There P.W1 never resided amicably with him. She resided only up to Dec.,1997 with his parents. After marriage P.W1 used to reside 10 days in his house and two months in her parents house. In the month of June 1998 his father brought P.W1 to his house on his 50 years celebration and even at that time she resided only for two weeks and went away. On that he has written a letter to P.W1 on 22-1-1999 to come and join him. Again on 1-2-1999 he has written another letter to come and join him. But she declined. He also deposes that he has filed the said two letters in the divorce case on the file of family court, Ongole It is submitted by him that he resided in rented house of Nagaralu up to the year 2002 and later he constructed a new house and shifted there from 2002 November. Even at that time also P.W1 and her family did

not attend house warming ceremony function. It is further submitted by him that P.W1 even did not attend when his junior paternal uncle got expired. He denies the allegations made by the petitioner. Coming to the present house he submits that there are two gate ways to his house situated on the eastern side and northern side. Besides that, there are vacant sites one eastern, western and northern side. He also deposes that there is no relationship between him and P.W1 since 1997. In the year 2010 he has filed divorce petition in Guntur and subsequently after 6 months of filing of divorce petition P.W1 has filed this 498-A case and DVC case. R.W2 & 3 said to friends of R.W1 deposes that they had acquaintance with the respondent and so they used to visit the house of R.W1 to play carams. At that juncture they did not observe P.W1 in the house of respondent when they questioned about the same the respondent stated that his wife went away after 1 ½ years of marriage.

19. R.W4 said to be manager in Andhra Bank of S.S.N Degree college bank Ongole was summoned by the respondent to give evidence on his behalf. He deposes that the account nos. bearing nos. 130520003003332 and 130520003003333 are in the name of petitioner. In the year 2008 she has opened the above accounts in his branch with the address particulars as G.Durga Rani D/o Audi narayana lawyer pet 33rd street, Rajiv nagar, Ongole He also deposes that his bank will show concerned address given by the party as residential address, The above two accounts have been operated with transactions by depositing an amount of Rs.1400/- and 700/- respectively from the date of opening. Again on 19-1-2011 she has closed the said accounts. He also brought the details of the above account particulars and Ex.R1 to R5 in his evidence

R1:- Customer account ledger report from 1-1-2008 to 21-10-2011 pertaining to account No.130520003003332 of the petitioner

Ex.R2: Customer account ledger report from 1-1-2008 to 21-10-2011 pertaining to account No.130520003003333 of petitioner

Ex.R3 Attested copy of request letter by petitioner to close her account and deposit the amount in account bearing No.00000892093 which is joint account of petitioner and her father Y.Audinarayana..

Ex.R4 is attested copy of recurring deposit pass book account bearing No.130520003003333

Ex.R5 is application of the petitioner for term deposit.

Ex.R6 is another recurring deposit bearing no 130520003003332

20. On careful perusal of evidence on record admittedly there is no dispute with regard to marriage between the parties. After marriage the petitioner proceeded to her matrimonial home to lead marital life. It was also not disputed by the respondent. So, the concept of domestic relationship and shared house is established. With regard to verbal and emotional violence, the main contention of petitioner is that the respondent and her in laws looked her well only for one year after marriage and there after they harassed her for want of dowry. Admittedly the petitioner and respondent had no issues. Though petitioner alleged elaborately against respondent in her evidence, the contention of respondent is that the petitioner resided with him only for short period and there after she herself deserted him on her own accord. He submits that she lived with him only up to the year 1997 December. Which means only for one year after marriage. And there after she went away to her parents house.

21. On this aspect though the petitioner denied the version of respondent merely for the sake of suggesting him, she did not contest the

same seriously to disprove it. Why because she herself admitted in her cross examination that the respondent has filed letters written by him in family court calling her to lead marital life with him. From the above admission it is clear that the respondent made an attempt for compromise with the petitioner. Moreover it is also clear that by the date of said letters she has been residing in her parental house. Which means she left her matrimonial home by that date itself. If really her version of harassment by the respondent is true she could not explain as to what prevented her to be silent in not filing police case against respondent from the year 2002 January to 2002 December. On this aspect she deposes that the respondent drove her in the year January 2002 and sent notice to her from where it can be inferred that by the year 2002 the respondent would have issued notice to the petitioner. She also deposes that again after attempt of mediation she was sent to her matrimonial home by her parents in the month of December 2002. It indicates that for one year she was at her parental house. So, on careful perusal of above evidence submitted by both parties it can be inferred that both his parties lived together only for one year and after that disputes arose between them. So, in view of above discussion the testimony of P.W1 is non believable.

22. Further, If really the version of petitioner about her stay with respondent is true she could depose the particulars of the house in which she resided with the respondent. But she sates that there are 5 windows and 5 doors to the house situated at Gorantla where as the respondents states that his house consists of 12 doors and 10 windows. From the above it is clear that petitioner not all resided with the respondent at Gorantla. Further more, she also admitted in her cross examination that she do not know whether her mother in law died or not.

From where it can be clearly inferred that she had no knowledge about her matrimonial home and so it shall be presumed that she never continued her relationship with the respondent.

23. Coming to the evidence of P.W2 & 3 they deposes that they attempted mediation for settlement of dispute by going to the house of respondent and has given Rs.1,00,000/- to the respondent. When such is the case no brother could say that he do not know ward number and door number of the house of his sister if really his version is true why because he admitted that he did not attend house warming ceremony of petitioners house. It is also deposed by P.W3 that he sat in the veranda of the house of respondent when he went to their house for giving Rs.1,00,000/- where as coming to the evidence of R.W1 he deposes that there is no varanda in his house which means it can be clearly inferred that P.W2 & 3 never visited the house of respondent for mediation as stated by them. Therefore the testimony of P.w2 & 3 with regard to giving one lakh ( Rs.1,00,000/-) is doubtful.

24. Further at another instance it is deposed by P.W1 that she was dropped in her parents house by the respondent when she refused to give divorce in the year 2003 December. Whereas she filed the case against respondent for the offence punishable U/sec 498-A IPC in the year 2010 as it could be seen from the registration of Crime i.e. Crime.No.209/2010. When such is the case she did not spell as to what prevented her to be silent in all these 7 years without taking any steps if really her version is true. Moreover the petitioner also admitted that she filed maintenance case in the year 2013 which means she filed all the cases after filing of HMOP by the respondent at Guntur. Except denial of suggestions made by respondent pertaining to her visit at the time of death of Junior paternal uncle of respondent she did not prove the same

by adducing cogent evidence. On the said aspect P.w2 & 3 also did not whisper anything. So, the testimonies of P.W1 to P.W3 are not corroborating together except making allegations for the purpose of this case. Therefore from the mere admission of petitioner about receiving letters from the respondent itself goes to show that the respondent made effort for calling upon the petitioner to join him to lead martial life.

25. So, the testimony of P.W1 is not believable with regard to allegation against respondents pertaining to hatching up plan to get rid of her.

26. With regard to claim U/sec. 18 of this Act. Though P.W1 claimed this relief, there are no such instances where P.W1 requires. Protection orders from R1 as P.W1 could not prove the same by cogent evidence. Then, coming to claim U/sec. 19 of the Act, it has to prove preliminary the act of giving dowry. The same could not be proved why because P.W1 in fact did not examine her father who is the correct person having personal knowledge about this fact. Moreover, there is no evidence even the video clippings or photographs filed showing that the dowry amount was given to respondents as now a days it became very common in marriage ceremonies to take such visuals for further consequences.

27. Pertaining to return of gold ornaments. Basically there are some customary practices in Hindu society since time immemorial as part from those customs only Stridhana, varadakshina arrived their species, specifically Stridhana is a concept of Hindu Law arisen from Varadakshina -which is associated with a Hindu Marriage practice of Kanyadanam. "Kanyadanam" being the gifts which father of bride gives to the father of groom.

28. Varadakshina was the presents in cash (or) kind which were to be given to bride groom Both kanyadhan and varadakshina were considered as meritorious act's and were voluntary in nature. Presents given to

daughter on occasion of marriage constitutes as Stridhana i.e., her separate property.

29. In deed the traditional giving of presents at (or) about the time of wedding is an accepted practice which finds mention in the oldest of Hindu Scriptures and is continued today with a greater zeal and unbrokenly. In Dowry Prohibition Act U/S 3 of the Act no person shall incur marriage expenses the aggregate value which exceeds five thousand rupees. However, in present ages the expenses, rates of every commodity raised in hike and it is not possible to restrain the expenses as stated in the D.P.Act .

30. Without minding this provision now a days performance of marriage has become a status quotation. Every person is performing marriage of his son (or) daughter by incurring lakhs and crores of rupees without accounting for as per standard of living. In that process they give many presents voluntary to bride (or) bride groom according to their financial capacity and those presents remain voluntary presents until relationships are good and amicable and become involuntary and unlawful, on demand after hurdles start in marital relations. In these circumstances and equal ages it is pertinent to treat those voluntary presents as voluntary only until contrary proved.

31. All the said articles are considered as given voluntarily as per custom prevailing and admittedly P.W.1 stated they were presented to RW1 during marriage. Hence any cash (or) kind, ornaments given voluntarily (or) by custom is not dowry and it is nowhere mentioned in any Act including present Act to return such presents and customary articles.

32. Similarly, the parents also provide utensils, ornaments, bedding and other household articles as per their own financial capacity to the

bride in the marriage. Even bridegroom party presents ornaments like Mangalsutra, Blackbeeds chain and sarees to bride etc., as per their financial capacity .

33. Hence, in absence of specific provision under the present Act and marriage expenses being customary in nature they are not liable for return as they are voluntary presents. Hence such claims not sustains.

34. Pertaining to other relief for maintenance and compensation, in the instant case P.W1 showed her unwillingness to reside in her matrimonial home. On her own account the same is evident from her own admission of receiving letters from respondent to join him to lead martial life. When such is the matter there shall be no concept of mental agony and emotional distress.

35. Why because as seen from the evidence of P.W1, it appeared that the she resided only for some period in her matrimonial home. Further coming to her maintenance as seem from Ex.R1 to R5 it is clear that the accounts have been opened on her name and amounts have been depoited in every month from whee it can not be stated that she is not in a psition to maintain herself. Therefore in view of above discussion it is clear that petitioner failed to prove her version by probable ends.

36. In the result, the petition is dismissed.

Typed to my dictation to the Shorthand writer, corrected and pronounced by me in Open Court, this the 6th day of January, 2015.

Sd/- Smt.D.Durga Kalyani  
III Addl. Judl. I Class Magistrate  
Ongole

**Appendix of Evidence**  
**Witnesses Examined**

**For Petitioners :**

Pw.1 : G.Durga Rani  
P.W2: Y.Suresh Babu

**For Respondents :**

R.W1: G.Sudhakar  
R.W2: M.Srinivasa Rao

P.W3: Ch.Venkata Rathaiah

R.W3: Ch.Purshothamma Rao

R.W4: B.Srinivasa Reddy

**Documents Marked**

Ex.R1: R.W4: Customer account ledger report pertaining to accounts  
No. 130520003003332

Ex.R2: R.W4: Customer account ledger report pertaining to accounts  
No. 130520003003333

Ex.R3:R.W4: Attested copy of request letter

Ex.R4:R.W4: Attested copy of recurring deposit pass book  
B.No.130520003003333

Ex.R5:R.W4: Application of petitioner for term deposit

Ex.R6: R.W4: Recurring deposit pass book B.No. 130520003003332

III AJCJ

// True Copy //

III-Addl. Judl. Magistrate of I-Class,

Ongole