

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 28<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2022

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.P. SANDESH

CRIMINAL REVISION PETITION NO.538/2011  
CONNECTED WITH  
CRIMINAL REVISION PETITION NO.322/2011

In CrI.R.P.538/2011

BETWEEN:

SMT S G CHITRA  
D/O S GANGADHARAPPA  
R/AT NO.656, T K LAYOUT  
KUVEMPUNAGAR  
BEHIND GURU RAGHAVENDRA  
KALYANA MANTAP  
MYSORE-570023

... PETITIONER

(BY SRI K.G.SADASHIVAIAH, ADVOCATE)

AND

1. DR. M B RENUKA PRASAD  
AGED ABOUT 39 YEARS

2. G BASAVANNA  
AGED ABOUT 76 YEARS

3. T S MONOMANI  
AGED ABOUT 60 YEARS

4. DR. M B JAYAPRAKASH  
AGED ABOUT 35 YEARS

ALL ARE R/AT 1093, 3<sup>RD</sup> CROSS  
MOKSHA MARGA, SIDDARTHANAGAR  
MYSORE-570011

... RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI S. ANIL KUMAR, ADVOCATE FOR  
SRI M.SIVAPPA, ADVOCATE)

THIS CRIMINAL REVISION PETITION IS FILED U/S.397 OF  
CR.P.C R/W SECTION 29 OF THE PROTECTION OF WOMEN FOR  
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE ACT BY THE PETITIONER PRAYING TO SET  
ASIDE THE ORDER DT:17.2.11 PASSED BY THE III ADDL.  
SESSIONS JUDGE, MYSORE IN CRL.A.NO.57/10 AND ETC.

IN CRL.R.P.322/2011

BETWEEN:

1. DR. M B RENUKA PRASAD  
AGED ABOUT 38 YEARS

2. G BASAVANNA  
AGED ABOUT 75 YEARS

3. T S MONONMANI  
AGED ABOUT 60 YEARS

4. DR. M B JAYAPRAKASH  
AGED ABOUT 35 YEARS

ALL ARE R/AT 1093, 3<sup>RD</sup> CROSS  
MOKSHA MARGA, SIDDARTHANAGAR  
MYSORE-570011

... PETITIONERS

(BY SRI S. ANIL KUMAR, ADVOCATE)

AND

S G CHITRA  
D/O S GANGADHARAPPA  
R/AT NO.656, T K LAYOUT  
KUVEMPUNAGAR  
BEHIND GURU RAGHAVENDRA  
KALYANA MANTAPA  
MYSORE

... RESPONDENT

(BY SRI K.G.SADASHIVAIAH, ADVOCATE)

THIS CRIMINAL REVISION PETITION IS FILED U/S.397 OF CR.P.C R/W SECTION 29 OF THE PROTECTION OF WOMEN FOR DOMESTIC VIOLENCE ACT BY THE PETITIONERS PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE ORDER DT:17.2.11 PASSED BY THE III ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE, MYSORE IN CRL.A.NO.61/10 AND ETC.

THE CRL.R.P.NO.538/2011 COMING ON FOR ORDERS AND CRL.R.P.NO.322/2011 COMING ON FOR HEARING THIS DAY, THE COURT MADE THE FOLLOWING:

**ORDER**

**In Crl.R.P.538/2011**

The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner has filed a memo seeking permission of this Court to withdraw the petition subject to return of the articles which are mentioned in the memo. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that except Santro Car i.e., Sl.No.1 in the memo, all other articles

had been received. The learned counsel appearing for the respondents would submit that the said car is parking outside the house and at any point of time, the petitioner can take the same. The counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is also ready to take the car and hence, there is no dispute with regard to the receiving of articles which have been mentioned in the memo.

2. In view of the said memo, the criminal revision petition is dismissed as withdrawn.

**In Crl.R.P.322/2011**

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that the petition does not survives for consideration. In view of above submission and since the respondent also agreed to take the car which is parked outside the house, this revision petition is dismissed as not survives for consideration.

**Sd/-  
JUDGE**

SN