

Received on .. 28.09.2015  
Registered on .. 28.09.2015  
Decided on .. 18.05.2018  
Duration .. 02-Yr. 07-Ms. 20-days

C.N.R. No. MHSN03-003049-2015

**IN THE COURT OF THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE, FIRST  
CLASS, SANGLI AT SANGLI.  
(Presided over by Smt. S. D. Javalkar)**

**REGULAR CRIMINAL CASE NO.402/2015**

**EXH. NO. \_\_\_\_\_.**

State of Maharashtra,  
Through Police Station Officer  
Vishrambaug Police Station.  
Sangli.

... **State**

**VERSUS**

1. Rahul Ramchandra Khedkar,  
Age-31 Years, Occ.–Service,
2. Sagar Ramchandra Khedkar,  
Age-28 Years, Occ.–Service,
3. Sou. Sunita Ramchandra Khedkar,  
Age-51 Years, Occ.– Household,
4. Ramchandra Rambhaji Khedkar,  
Age-61 Years, Occ.– Retired,  
No.1 to 4 R/o. S. T. Colony, Sangli.
5. Hari Babu Khedkar,  
Age-54 Years, Occ.– Agriculture,  
R/o. Khed, Tal. Pandharpur,  
Dist. Solapur.

... **Accused.**

=====  
Learned A.P.P. Smt. J. S. Dake for State.

Learned Advocate Shri. H. M. Patil for accused.  
=====

**JUDGMENT**

(Delivered on 18<sup>th</sup> May 2018)

The charge-sheet has been filed against the accused for offences punishable under Sections 498(A), 323, 504 and 506 read with 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860.

**Prosecution's Case:-**

02. On and about 26-04-2013 to 08-06-2015 the complainant was mentally and physically harassed by the accused No.1 to 5 at their residential place at Flat No.1, Bhagyashri Apartment, S.T. Colony, Vishrambaug, Sangli. The accused No.1 is the husband of the complainant, accused No.2 is the brother-in-law, accused No.3 is mother in law, accused No.4 is the father-in-law and No.5 is brother-in-law. The accused No.3 gave insulting treatment to the complainant by saying that, she is unable to cook good food and that she does not dress-up properly, could not behave properly. Further accused No.3 ill-treated her by saying that the parents of complainant have not given sufficient gold ornaments in the marriage of complainant and accused No.1. Accused No.3 and No.1 always asked the complainant to call her parents, if at all she desires to visit her maternal home. The accused No.1 and 3 ill-treated her on petty issues and used bad language to her. They also gave her beatings and used bad words to her. The accused No.1 to 5 demanded an amount of Rs.75,000/- and 2.5 tolas of gold from her parents and due this reason gave beatings to her. During the period of her pregnancy accused No.1 and 3 continuously insisted her to carry out sex determination test and forced her for the same. The said

harassment continued till 08-06-2015 and hence the complainant has lodged FIR with Vishrambaug police station for the same.

03. On the basis of FIR, C.R. No.135/2015 was registered. During investigation, spot panchanama was prepared, marriage invitation card and light bill were collected. Statements of witnesses were recorded. Accused were arrested. After completion of investigation, charge-sheet came to be filed.

04. The charges were framed against the accused at Exh.20 for offences punishable under Sections 498(A), 323, 504 and 506 read with 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860. It was read over and explained in vernacular to the accused persons to which they pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried. They have raised defence that they have been implicated in a false case which they have reiterated in their respective statements (Exh.54 to 58) recorded *vide* S. 313 of the Criminal Procedure Code.

05. Following points arise for determination and I have recorded my findings thereon with reasons as follows :-

Sr.No.	Points for Determination	Findings
1	Does the prosecution prove that, on and about 26-04-2013 to 08-06-2015, in Flat No.1, Bhagyashri Apartment, S.T. Colony, Vishrambaug, Sangli, all the accused in furtherance of their common intention, subjected the informant Sou. Madhuri Rahul Khedkar to cruelty ?	No.

Sr.No.	Points for Determination	Findings
2	Does the prosecution prove that, at above said period and place, all the accused, in furtherance of their common intention, voluntarily caused hurt to the informant Sou. Madhuri Rahul Khedkar by means of kicks and fists blows ?	No.
3	Does the prosecution prove that, on above said date, time and place, all the accused, in furtherance of their common intention, intentionally insulted to the informant Sou. Madhuri Rahul Khedkar and thereby gave provocation intending or knowing it to be likely that such provocation will cause her to break the public peace ?	No.
4	Does the prosecution prove that, on above said period and place, all the accused, in furtherance of their common intention, committed criminal intimidation by threatening the informant Sou. Madhuri Rahul Khedkar ?	No.
5	What order ?	As per final order.

### REASONS

06. Prosecution has examined in all four witnesses. Informant (PW1) Madhuri Rahul Khedkar (Exh.33), PW2 Pancha witness, Rajkumar Vithal Sathe (Exh.41), PW3 Brother of complainant- Amol Mohan Pawar (Exh.45) and PW4 Investigating Officer Shri. Dadasaheb Mahadeo Budhavale (Exh.49). FIR dated 08-06-2015 (Exh.34), Spot Panchanama (Exh.42), Light Bill Exh.50, Marriage invitation Card Exh.51, Application given to S.P. Sangli dated 10-04-2015 (Exh. 52) and application to P.I. Vishrambaug Police Station (Exh.53).

07. Heard both the sides. Perused the documents.

**AS TO POINTS NO.1 TO 4:-**

08. The points are inter-connected. Therefore, they are discussed together. It would be desirable to discuss the available evidence *vis-a-vis* ingredients of the alleged offences.

09. Informant (PW1) Madhuri Rahul Khedkar stated in her examination in chief that accused No.3 caused harassment to her by saying that she could not cook good food and could not behave properly. The accused No.3 always picked-up quarrel whenever the complainant asked for her visit to her maternal home. The accused No.3 also used bad and filthy language to her and gave beatings to her for the same. The accused No.3 used to insist that, the parents of the complainant should come to their place and accompany their daughter to their home. The accused No.2 and 4 used to curse her by saying that, she does not maintain herself in proper way and used bad words and gave her beatings. The accused No.1 all the time demanded Rs.75,000/- from the complainant for purchasing new vehicle and also 2.5 tolas gold chain from her parents. The accused No.3 never allowed the complainant to reside with her husband at Pune and insisted her to reside at Sangli. The accused No.3 all the time told false things about the complainant to her husband i.e. accused No.1 and lowered her image before her husband. The accused No.2 to 4 used to keep the complainant on starvation and gave beatings to her.

10. After few days when she was pregnant the accused No.3 insisted the complainant to conduct sex determination test to which the complainant denied. For this reason the accused started harassing her

on different grounds. The accused No.5 called the complainant and talked to her in bad language while on the call. The complainant gave birth to baby girl and when she gave this news to the accused, they were upset due to birth of girl child. They insisted her that she should bring Rs.75,000/- and 2.5 tolas of gold chain while returning to her matrimonial home, if she fails the doors of their home will be closed for her. The accused persons always said that, they wanted a baby boy for their family and now if the complaint has given birth to baby girl she has no place at her matrimonial home. After that the complainant requested several times to accused No.1 to take her to her matrimonial home, but he deliberately avoided to do so. The complainant is at her maternal home since 08-02-2014 till today.

11. In her cross-examination she admitted that the accused No.3 and 4 had accompanied her to Pune to drop her at the place of her husband i.e. accused No.1. She also admitted that she visited her maternal home on the occasion of Raksha-Bandhan and other festivals. She further admitted that she resided at the place of accused No.1 i.e. her husband at Pune for about 3 to 4 months. She further admitted that accused No.2 is serving at Walchand College, Sangli as a Professor. But she was not aware of his timing as he used to be frequently at home. She also admitted that the financial condition of her husband is better than her parents. She also admitted that her husband already had four wheeler at the time of their marriage. She further admitted that during this period she was not inclined to lodge FIR against the accused for the harassment caused to her by them. She further admitted that, when she was pregnant, accused No.3 accompanied her to the hospital during her treatment. She also admitted that accused No.1 to 4 have borne Rs.35,000/- for the purchase of her clothes at the time of their marriage. She also admitted that accused No.3 and 4 have purchased small ganthan, gold ring, big ganthan, silver leg chain (Painjan) and pearl

neck-lace (मोट्याचा हार) in her marriage. She further admitted that she has not mentioned in the FIR that, the accused had demanded money for purchasing of four wheeler. She also admitted that accused No.3 used to accompany her for evening walking during period of her pregnancy. She further admitted that Adv. Manoj Inamdar is the family friend of her maternal relatives and they seek his advice in certain legal matters.

12. She specifically admitted that accused No.5 never resided at her matrimonial home with the other matrimonial relatives. She further admitted that she could not state the date, time as to when accused No.3 insisted her to conduct the sex determination test. She also admitted that accused No.5 lodged complaint with Karkamb Police Station against her father, brother and uncle. She admitted that she has moved written complaint on 10-04-2015 at the office of S.P. Sangli. She specifically admitted that, in this complaint with the S.P. that, she has not mentioned that accused No.2 to 4 used bad language to her and gave her beatings. She further admitted that accused No.2 to 4 were present for the cradle ceremony of her daughter. She further admitted that accused No.1 sent her legal notice claiming divorce from her on 29-03-2015. She also admitted that she had voluntarily been to her matrimonial home after the birth of her daughter. But she had not mentioned this fact in her complaint or application and has mentioned at first time before the Court. She specifically admitted that before the application for divorce by accused No.1 was filed, she had never complained about the mental and physical harassment caused to her by accused No.1 to 5. She also admitted that after lodging the present FIR she had never been to her matrimonial home. Except these admissions nothing came on record during the cross-examination of the complainant, which would help the accused.

13. PW2 Rajkumar (Panch) stated in his examination in chief that, he visited Flat No.1, Bhagyashri Apartment, S.T. Colony alongwith Akshay Bansode. Panchanama was carried out in his presence and is duly proved in evidence. In his cross-examination he admitted that he does not know as to how many floors exists in Bhagyashree Apartment. He further admitted that he has no idea about the direction of the main door of flat No.1 of Bhagyashri Apartment. He also admitted that when he visited the spot during the panchanama, the presence or absence of any person is not mentioned in the panchanama.

14. PW3 Amol stated in his examination in chief that, the complainant Madhuri used to inform him as to the mental and physical torture inflicted upon her by the accused persons. She also used to inform certain incidents when she visited her maternal home for festivals. He further stated that the accused persons demanded Rs.75,000/- from her and 2.5 tolas of gold from her parents. He further stated that his sister i.e. complainant Madhuri requested them to fulfill the demands of the accused persons. He further stated that the accused persons denied the complainant to stay at her matrimonial home and refused to accept her calls and discontinued contacts with her.

15. In his cross-examination PW3 Amol admitted that, accused No.1 is residing at Pune for the purpose of his job and most of the times is unavailable at flat No.1 Bhagyashri Apartment. He stated that his sister, complainant Madhuri resided for a period of few months only at her husband's place i.e at Pune and most of the time she resided at flat No.1, Bhagyashri Apartment with her in laws. He further admitted that accused No.2 is serving at Walchand College, Sangli since the time of marriage of complainant and accused No.1 and also today. He further admitted that he has not stated in his statement before the police that the accused persons, mentally and physically harassed the complainant



Madhuri on different grounds. He further specifically admitted that the accused persons were present for the cradle ceremony of daughter of his sister i.e. complainant Madhuri. He then specifically admitted that neither he nor his father accompanied complainant Madhuri to her matrimonial home for co-habitation after the cradle ceremony of her daughter. He also admitted that in the year 2015 accused had issued notice to the complainant on the grounds that she is not ready for cohabitation with accused No.1 and thereby claimed divorce from her. These were the material admissions by the witness.

16. PW4 Dadasaheb Budhavale, I.O. stated in his examination in chief that, he visited the spot of incident and carried out panchanama in presence of two panchas. He duly proved the panchanama and admitted the contents. He procured the light bill of flat No.1, Bhagyashri Apartment, which bears the name of accused persons as owner of the said flat. He conducted the investigation and filed charge-sheet against the accused. In his investigation it revealed that the accused persons illegally demanded money and gold from the complaint. They also inflicted mental and physical harassment to the complainant and pressurized her to conduct sex determination test. In his cross examination he admitted that, he has not recorded the statements of the persons residing in the nearby flats. He also admitted that the area where Bhagyashri Apartment is situated is a crowded area and the said apartment is at a distance of ½ km from Vishrambaug Police Station.

17. The witness PW4 Dadasaheb further admitted that he himself has not conducted any investigation in respect of application at Exh.52. He further admitted that the name of accused No.5 is not mentioned in the application at Exh.52. He further stated that he has not carried out any investigation in respect of any letter or notice sent to the complainant by the accused. He further admitted that he has no

knowledge about the mobile number or land-line number of the accused persons. He further stated that brother of complainant i.e. PW3 has stated in his statement before the police that the accused persons used to threaten the complainant by giving her apprehension of beatings. He further specifically admitted that he has carried out the panchanama in the police station.

18. **DISCUSSION :-**

A) **Illegal Demands:-**

It has come in the evidence of the complainant PW1 that the accused no.1 demanded Rs. 75,000/- from her on the count of purchase of new vehicle and also 2.5 tolas gold chain. The said allegations are corroborated by her brother Amol PW3 and I.O. PW4. The complainant has failed to bring on record as to which vehicle the accused no.1 desired to purchase. Also how and when did he made the illegal demands. Certain instances like purchase of clothes of complainant and gold ornaments at the time of marriage are admitted by the complainant. It shows that the accused were in good financial condition which is admitted by the complainant in her cross examination. The accused owned four wheeler and two wheeler before marriage of complainant and accused no.1 which indicates that they are financially sound. Accused no. 1 is working at Pune and accused no.2 is serving at Walchand College, Sangli. If at all they wished to demand an amount or a gold ornament then why only small amount in thousands whereas they could have demanded some more amount. The conduct of the accused and the admissions given by the complainant do not incline towards forming view that the accused persons can be termed as greedy people. Hence by considering the evidence on record, no possibility is made out that they must have harassed the complainant for their demands.

B) **Ill-treatment/Mental and Physical Harassment** :-

(i) The complainant has stated in her examination in chief that accused no. 2 to 4 used to taunt her that she does not dress up properly and cannot cook good quality food. The complainant has allegations against the accused no. 3 mainly on the grounds that she used to quarrel with the complainant that her maternal relatives should come to their place to take the complainant to her maternal home and drop her again to their place. Also accused no. 3 used to curse her by using bad words and used to give her beatings. The accused no. 3 did not allow her to reside with her husband at Pune and compelled her to stay at Sangli. Accused No. 2 to 4 used to keep the complainant on starvation, gave beatings to her and cursed her on petty issues. But the complainant has failed to bring on record the exact words used by the accused at the time of their quarrels. No specific date or time or occasion is mentioned by the complainant when the accused persons subjected her to cruelty. No strong ground made out to conclude that the accused caused mental harassment to the complainant. Petty issues are part of practical life and are required to be resolved at that time itself. No family exist without differences but they should be handled with a broad prospective and in the welfare of whole family and not for well being of an individual.

(ii) Accused no. 5 never resided with the complainant under one roof is an admitted fact by the complainant. She has also admitted that she has not mentioned in her report with the police dated 10/04/15 that accused no. 2 to 4 gave beatings to her and used bad words to her.

(iii) Spot panchnama in such kind of offences is formal. It is not expected from the panch witness or the I.O. that they should have knowledge about the number of steps or the floors or the number of flats or the direction of the flat/apartment. Also the flat is owned by the

accused is not denied by them. The details as to the mobile number of accused, receipts, etc are not brought on record as supportive evidence.

**C) Compelled to conduct sex determination test:-**

Though the complainant has specifically alleged that the accused forced her to conduct sex determination test, there is nothing brought on record to that effect. Her allegations in this aspect are limited upto accused no. 3 only. But she failed to examine the M.O. in that context. The complainant did not even examine any other person of the hospital where she used to take treatment during her pregnancy. Also the said test is not conducted remains a fact. Mere oral allegations are not sufficient to hold the accused persons guilty for the said allegations.

19. **Provisions of Law :-**

**Section 498-A of I.P.C.** – Husband or relative of husband of a woman subjecting her to cruelty – Whoever, being the husband or the relative of the husband of a woman, subjects such woman to cruelty shall be punished.

Explanation – (b) harassment of the woman where such harassment is with a view to coercing her or any person related to her to meet any unlawful demand for any property or valuable security or is on account of failure by her or any person related to her to meet such demand.

20. The learned Advocate for accused has relied on the following case laws -

(I) '*STATE OF MAHARASHTRA V/S. NAVNATH EKNATH JAIGUDE*', (2009 ALL (CRI) 1497, in which the Hon'ble Bombay High Court has held that -

*'Cruelty and harassment alleged by prosecution vague and general in nature. Hence, each and every harassment is not sufficient to hold the accused guilty. It is only that harassment which ultimately forces the deceased to commit suicide which is material and can be taken into account.'*

In the case in hand there is nothing on record brought by the prosecution which proves that the complainant Madhuri was mentally and physically harassed to the extent that she attempted to commit suicide. But in the later part of the section, harassment in different kinds is contemplated. In the present case the complainant failed to prove the alleged harassment to such extent. *No such instances are brought on record to say that the complainant was subjected to cruelty.*

(II) *'MUKESH S/O. RAMSWARUP PASHINE V/S. STATE OF MAHARASHTRA'*, (2006 ALL MR (CRI) N.O.C. 62, in which the Hon'ble Bombay High Court (Nagpur bench) has held that -

*'Prosecution evidence, heap of stray- tales stories, which even taken together does not make a complete story of ill-treatment. The testimonies of prosecution witnesses are not matching to each other. Hence, it would be extremely risky to rely upon such quality of prosecution evidence where nothing comes out consistently.'*

In the case in hand there is no instance of mis-matching of the testimonies of the prosecution witnesses. Though they are not mis matching are not sufficient to convict the accused. The detail discussion as to the testimony of the prosecution witnesses is taken in the relevant paragraphs.

(III) *'JAYAWANTABAI W/O. SATYADEO SADAFALÉ V/S. STATE OF MAHARASHTRA'*, (2008 ALL MR (CRI) 189, in which the Hon'ble Bombay High Court (Nagpur bench) has held that -

*'In case of demand of dowry, dowry is of any property given or*

agreed to be given before or after the marriage in connection with marriage. If it was not agreed to be given in connection with marriage, that may become unlawful demand at the most, but cannot be treated as a demand for dowry. It must be shown that physical harassment was such that any person would have preferred to put an end to the life instead of bearing physical harassment.'

In the case in hand the complainant has not committed suicide or attempted for the same. The grounds of causing suicide are grave and depending upon many other circumstances like mental capability of the victim, her tolerance level, her general attitude towards the surroundings, etc. In the present case the harassment as alleged is not enough to punish the accused. Certain differences in family exist but it cannot be said that there is no scope for improvement and the same shall continue.

(IV) '*STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH V/S. KALIDINDI SAHADEVUDU & ORS*', (2012 CRI.L.J. 2302, in which the Hon'ble Andhra Pradesh High Court has held that -

*'The accused by clearly commenting that deceased was not begetting children cannot be said to have committed cruelty within the meaning of Section 498-A.'*

In the case in hand there are no such allegations of the prosecution that the accused persons mentally harassed the complainant on the count of '**not begetting children.**' Hence, the present case law is not applicable in the case in hand.

(V) '*SANJAY JAIN V/S. STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH*', (2013 CRI L.J. 668, in which the Hon'ble Madhya Pradesh High Court has held that -

*'The fact that there used to be some quarrels between the deceased and the accused, but no evidence on record that he used to subject her to*

*harassment or to cruelty such as causing grave injury to life or limb.'*

In the case in hand there is evidence in the nature of testimony of the complainant about the harassment. Quarrels are part of routine life and inevitable since there are differences in views of the people residing together. Nothing is on record showing any grave or serious injury to the complainant.

(VI) '*BALJNATH AND OTHERS V/S. STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH*', (*AIR 2016 SUPREME COURT 5313*), in which the Hon'ble Madhya Pradesh High Court has held that -

*'Prosecution failed to proved precise cause of death or deceased as to whether it was suicidal or homicidal. Ingredients of cruelty and harassment not proved by direct and cogent evidence and not sufficient by itself to hold accused persons guilty of offence under Section 498-A.'*

In the case in hand there are no considerable evidences on record to show the alleged cruelty on the complainant which is sufficient to drive her to commit suicide. Also no such allegations are made. Hence the case law is applicable to the case in hand.

(VII) '*STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH V/S. M. MADHUSUDHAN RAO*', (*SUPREME COURT*), in which the Andhra Pradesh High Court has held that -

*'Delaying in filing complaint with no worth explanation raises doubt regarding the genuineness of the complainant rendering it unsafe to base the conviction of the accused.'*

In the case in hand the complainant had ample opportunity to take proper action against the accused. She kept silent till the divorce petition was filed. Also no reasonable ground is shown to explain the delay which creates a doubt as to the credibility of the complainant. The citation is therefore applicable to the case in hand.

21. **Grounds to disbelieve the prosecution story :-**

A) No details as to time, date and occasion of any of the alleged physical or mental harassment is brought on record and proved in evidence by the complainant.

B) Parents of the informant are not examined who are equally important witness as that of complainant herself. The illegal demands as alleged were made to them through the complainant. They should have stepped into the witness box and stated the harassment caused to their daughter. This conduct compels to draw a negative inference and creates doubt as to the genuineness of the prosecution story.

C) No medical certificate is brought on record to prove the physical cruelty/ harassment and the injuries sustained by the complainant. Also no prescription or any details as to any test conducted on the complainant is brought on record. No M.O. is examined to strengthen the case of the prosecution. No details as to the body part where the injury was inflicted or the description of the wound or beatings is mentioned in the FIR or in her examination in chief.

D) The complainant has admitted that the financial condition of the accused was better than her parents. They owned a flat, four wheeler and two wheeler before marriage of the complainant and accused no. 1. Also it is admitted by the complainant that the accused have purchased golden ornaments for her and spent Rs. 35,000/- for her clothes in the marriage of complainant and the accused no. 1. This fact does not create any base to consider the allegations of the complainant as to the illegal demands to be true.



E) Lodging of FIR by the complainant after the divorce petition was filed by the accused no. 1 itself reveals that it is a after thought process of the complainant and made out of some personal grudge against the accused. She had ample opportunity to take proper action against the accused but she failed to do so. She never attempted to return to her matrimonial home inspite of the fact that the accused persons were repeatedly asking her to come for cohabitation. Also she never visited her matrimonial home voluntarily for cohabitation. As a last attempt, the accused no.1 sent her legal notice because she did not come for cohabitation inspite of several requests.

F) Accused no. 5 never resided with the complainant under one roof. Hence the allegations made against him are baseless. No specific words are brought on record by the complainant to attract the alleged offences.

G) It is specifically admitted by the I.O. that he had prepared the panchnama at Police station instead of preparing the same at the spot of incident. This creates a strong ground to doubt on the accuracy and genuineness of the panchanama.

H) Allegations as to compelling the complainant to stay at Sangli and not at Pune is there internal family arrangement which keeps on changing as the circumstances changes. Undue importance is given to this factor by the complainant. In todays era, many couples live separate from each other due to their profession /job profile or out of certain family arrangements. This particular aspect cannot be termed as causing cruelty to the female of that family.

I) It is admitted by the complainant that all accused persons were present for the cradle ceremony of her daughter. This shows the

involvement of the accused person and their belongingness towards the baby girl and in the complainant also. If at all they were upset on the birth of girl child they would have reacted in a different way.

J) No clear allegations against accused no. 2, 4, 5. No details mentioned as to how they caused ill-treatment to the complainant. No specific event mentioned by the complainant.

K) Whole story based on vague allegations as to harassment. Only oral contentions of the complainant without any supporting evidence. Hence the ingredients of the offence cannot be said to be proved.

22. Considering the nature of offence, it is essential to note here that these kinds of offences are particularly matrimonial offences wherein the persons of one family are involved. Due to the differences in opinion and the mindset of these persons, misunderstandings are created which later on give rise to quarrels and which lead to various offences. Every person in the family is required to keep a broad view and handle the situations and adversities in the interest of the family and not in favour of any individual. Hence, taking into consideration entire evidence on record, **I answer point No.1 to 4 in the negative.**

23. From the above discussion, it becomes clear that, the prosecution has failed to prove the allegations against the accused beyond reasonable doubts. Though in such offences special weightage should be given to the version of the complainant, it should also be corroborated by other supportive evidence. In absence of such evidence vague allegations of the complainant cannot be taken as true. There are many instances in society wherein females of mischievous nature spoil

the family peace by making false allegations and by unnecessarily involving innocent persons in the offence. From the discussion above, I find no substance in the various allegations of the complainant. Hence, I hold that accused persons are innocent and not liable for the offences punishable under Section 498A, 323, 504 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code. **Hence, to answer Point No.5, I proceed to pass following order.**

**ORDER**

01. The Accused No. 1 to 5 are hereby acquitted for the offence punishable under Sections 498(A), 323, 504 and 506 read with 34 of Indian Penal ode,1860 vide Section 248(1) of the Code of Criminal Procedure,1973.

02. Bail bonds of all accused persons stands cancelled.

(Dictated, pronounced and signed in open Court.)

Sangli  
Date : 18/05/2018

**(Smt. S.D. Javalgekar)**  
Judicial Magistrate First Class  
(Court No.5) Sangli.