INDIALAW



CRIMINAL | FAMILY LAW

Matrimonial Cruelty as a Continuing Offence: Kerala High Court on Delay, Evidence and Section 498A IPC

AUTHOR Durgesh Singh, Ritika Dedhia

PUBLISHED 5 March 2026

In a recent judgment of the High Court of Kerala, in Pravin Kumar Vs. State of Karala[1], undertook a detailed examination of the scope and application of Section 498A of the Indian Penal Code. The case arose from concurrent findings of conviction by the trial court and the appellate court against a husband accused of subjecting his wife to cruelty in connection with dowry demands.

The principal question before the Court was not merely whether the evidence supported the conviction, but whether, in exercise of its limited revisional jurisdiction under Sections 397 and 401 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, any interference was warranted with the findings recorded by the courts below.

The judgment is significant for its articulation of three interconnected legal principles: the restricted ambit of revisional powers, the characterization of matrimonial cruelty as a continuing offence, and the contextual approach required in appreciating delay and testimonial inconsistencies in prosecutions under Section 498A IPC. By reaffirming the protective intent of Section 498A while simultaneously emphasising procedural restraint in revision, the Court contributes meaningfully to the evolving jurisprudence on dowry-related cruelty and judicial scrutiny thereof.

Table of contents

- I. Legal Framework: Section 498A IPC
- II. Revisional Jurisdiction: Limited Scope of Interference
- III. Continuing Offence and Delay in Lodging the Complaint
- IV. Appreciation of Evidence in Section 498A Cases
- V. Sentencing: Judicial Discretion and Proportionality
- Conclusion

I. Legal Framework: Section 498A IPC

Section 498A IPC criminalises cruelty inflicted upon a married woman by her husband or his relatives. “Cruelty” under the provision includes:

- Any wilful conduct likely to drive the woman to suicide or cause grave injury (physical or mental); and
- Harassment with a view to coercing her or her relatives to meet unlawful dowry demands.

The provision was enacted as a protective measure against dowry-related violence and systemic domestic abuse, recognising the structural vulnerability of married women within matrimonial households.

II. Revisional Jurisdiction: Limited Scope of Interference

The revision petition challenged concurrent findings of conviction under Section 498A IPC. The High Court emphasised that revisional powers under Sections 397 and 401 of the Code of Criminal Procedure are not equivalent to appellate powers.

Interference in revision is justified only where:

- Findings are perverse or legally untenable;
- There is gross error or glaring unreasonableness;
- The decision is based on no evidence;
- Material evidence has been ignored; or
- Judicial discretion has been exercised arbitrarily.

The Court reaffirmed that a re-appreciation of evidence is not ordinarily warranted unless such grave infirmities are demonstrated.

III. Continuing Offence and Delay in Lodging the Complaint

One of the principal grounds urged by the defence was the alleged delay in lodging the First Information Statement, contending that such delay undermined the credibility of the prosecution case. The High Court decisively rejected this argument by invoking the doctrine of “continuing offence” in the context of matrimonial cruelty under Section 498A of the Indian Penal Code.

Placing reliance on the Supreme Court's decision in V.K. Mishra v. State of Uttarakhand[2], the Court reiterated that cruelty within a matrimonial relationship rarely manifests as a single, isolated act. Rather, it is often constituted by a series of repeated acts that collectively form a sustained pattern of harassment and abuse. Each instance contributes to a continuing course of conduct, thereby attracting the doctrine of continuing offence.

The High Court highlights that matrimonial cruelty cannot be dissected into discrete, time-bound events divorced from their broader context. The suffering endured by the victim frequently persists over an extended period, shaped by ongoing coercion, intimidation, and violence. Consequently, delay in reporting such cruelty does not, by itself, render the prosecution case doubtful, provided the evidence on record is otherwise cogent and credible.

Importantly, the Court recognised the socio-legal realities that often account for delayed complaints in matrimonial disputes. A woman may endure abuse in the hope of reconciliation or under pressure from her family to preserve the marital bond. Social stigma associated with initiating criminal proceedings against a spouse, economic dependence, concern for children, and emotional trauma including fear of further retaliation may all operate as significant deterrents to immediate reporting.

By acknowledging these lived realities, the judgment affirms that delay in lodging a complaint under Section 498A IPC must be assessed contextually and not through a rigid or mechanical lens. The credibility of the prosecution case must be evaluated on the totality of circumstances, rather than on the mere chronology of complaint.

IV. Appreciation of Evidence in Section 498A Cases

The Court highlights that testimony of a victim of matrimonial cruelty must be evaluated with sensitivity and realism. A hyper-technical approach, it observed, would defeat the object of Section 498A IPC.

In the present case, the conviction was supported by:

- The consistent testimony of the complainant;
- Corroborative evidence from neighbours;
- Medical evidence in the form of a wound certificate; and
- Proof of physical assault during pregnancy.

The Court held that minor discrepancies, particularly from a rustic witness narrating past events, do not erode the core prosecution case when the overall testimony inspires confidence.

Importantly, the Court reaffirmed that dowry-linked physical assault is not a "mere domestic dispute" but a serious criminal offence rooted in coercion and gender-based violence.

V. Sentencing: Judicial Discretion and Proportionality

While confirming the conviction under Section 498A IPC, the High Court exercised discretion to modify the sentence. The appellate court had already reduced the punishment to one year's simple imprisonment with fine. The High Court further reduced the substantive sentence to six months' simple imprisonment, maintaining the fine.

This reflects a calibrated approach:

- Conviction upheld to affirm the statutory mandate against dowry cruelty;
- Sentence moderated considering mitigating circumstances and proportionality.

Conclusion

This decision of the High Court of Kerala meaningfully advances the interpretative framework of Section 498A of the Indian Penal Code on multiple fronts.

First, it reiterates the narrow contours of revisional jurisdiction, emphasising that concurrent findings of fact cannot be disturbed in the absence of perversity, illegality, or manifest unreasonableness. Second, it firmly recognises matrimonial cruelty as a continuing offence, thereby situating acts of harassment within their broader, cumulative context. Third, it clarifies that delay in lodging a complaint is not, by itself, determinative of falsity, particularly in cases shaped by complex social and familial dynamics. Finally, it highlights the necessity of appreciating the testimony of victims of matrimonial cruelty with sensitivity and realism, cautioning against a hyper-technical approach that would dilute the protective object of the provision.

In doing so, the judgment strikes a careful balance between procedural discipline in the exercise of revisional powers and the substantive mandate of safeguarding married women from dowry-related abuse.

For more details, write to us at: contact@indialaw.in

Related Practice Areas

Criminal Litigation **Family Law Dispute**