

‘Respondent’ – To include females

Sr. No.	Title	Citation	Question involved	Held
1	Hiral P. Harsora Vs Kusum Narottam Dass Harsora	2016 (4) RCR (Civil) 750; Law Finder Id # 795383 (SC)	Whether aggrieved mother in law can file complaint against daughter in law	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Held – Complaint under DV Act can be filed against female whether adult or non adult. • The words ‘adult male’ u/s 2(q) struck out as these words discriminate between person similarly situated and are contrary to the object sought to be achieved by the 2005 Act • Once the words ‘adult male’ are struck down the proviso to section 2(f) has not independent existence. • Therefore, an aggrieved mother in law can file complaint against daughter in law where she is a victim of domestic violence.
2	Sou Sandhya Manoj Wankhade Vs Manoj Bhimrao Wankhade and ors.	2011 (1) KLT 609 (SC)	‘Respondent’ – To include females	Although Section 2(q) defines ‘Respondent’ to mean any adult male person, who is or has been in a DR with AP, the proviso widens the scope of said definition by including relative of husband or male partner within scope of complaint, which may be filed by an aggrieved wife or female living in relationship in nature of marriage – If Legislature intended to exclude females from ambit of complaint, which can be filed by an aggrieved wife, females would have been specifically excluded, instead of it being provided in proviso that a complaint could also be filed against relative of husband or male partner – No restrictive meaning had been

				<p>given to expression “relative”, nor had the said expression been specifically defined in the DV Act, to make it specific to males only – Therefore, legislature never intended to exclude female relatives of husband or male partner from ambit of complaint that could be made under provisions of the DV Act.</p>
3	<p>Smt. Menakuru Renuka Vs Smt. Menakuru Mohan Reddy</p>	<p>2009 (3) Crimes 473 (AP HC)</p>	<p>‘Respondent’ – To include females</p>	<p>It has to be treated that the proviso to section 2 (q) intends to include only male persons other than those in DR also. There appears to be unintentional omission to specifically exclude women in the proviso or it may be because mains section makes it clear that only male persons can be respondent, it is not again specified in the proviso. The intention of the Act is to exclude women altogether from the definition of respondent.</p>