

S. No.	Court	Date	Petitioner	Respondent	Summary of Judgment
1	Punjab HC	2008	Anmol Kahlon @ Anmol Kaur	State of Punjab & another	NRI 498a quash based on marriage being annulled (http://www.indiankanoon.org/doc/326172/)
2	Supreme Court	1992	Bhajan Lal	State of Haryana	(3) Where the uncontroverted allegations made in the FIR or complaint and the evidence collected in support of the same do not disclose the commission of any offence and make out a case against the accused. (5) Where the allegations made in the FIR or complaint are so absurd and inherently improbable on the basis of which no prudent person can ever reach a just conclusion that there is sufficient ground for proceeding against the accused (7) Where a criminal proceeding is manifestly attended with malafide and/or where the proceeding is maliciously instituted with an ulterior motive for wreaking vengeance on the accused and with a view to spite him due to private and personal grudge. (http://judis.nic.in/supremecourt/qrydisp.aspx?file_name=7332)
3	Supreme Court	2004	Y. Abraham Ajith	Inspector of Police, Chennai and others	Incidentally, it was also a case of strained relationship between the husband and wife. All the alleged offences were committed according to the complainant at Nagarcoil but the wife filed the complaint at Chennai Court. The Hon'ble Supreme Court held that no part of cause of action arose in Chennai and therefore, the Magistrate concerned had no jurisdiction to deal with the matter. Accordingly, the proceedings were quashed (http://www.indiankanoon.org/doc/1120620/)
4	Supreme Court	13 Nov, 2009	Pashaura Singh	State of Punjab & another	Foreign Divorce is valid in India (http://indiankanoon.org/doc/174511/)
5	Delhi HC	29 Jul, 2010	Harbans Lal Malik	Payal Malik	Presumption as to foreign judgments. The Court shall presume upon the production of any document purporting to be a certified copy of a foreign judgment that such judgment was pronounced by a Court of competent jurisdiction, unless the contrary appears on the record; but such presumption may be displaced by proving want of jurisdiction (http://indiankanoon.org/doc/115415/)
6	Bombay HC	4-Mar-10	Kashmira Kale	Kishore Kumar Mohan Kale	Foreign judgement cannot be claimed to be ex-parte (http://www.indiankanoon.org/doc/765708/)
7	Punjab HC	4-Oct-10	Partap Singh and another	State of Punjab and another	No 498a after foreign divorce (http://advocateseema.in/files/Partap_Singh_And_Another_vs_State_Of_Punjab_And_Another_on)

					4_November_2010.pdf)
8	Patna HC	20-Sep-10	DHANANJAY KUMAR TIWARY	STATE OF BIHAR	498A quashed in private complaint after considering police report (http://www.indiankanoon.org/doc/446963/)
9	Supreme Court	19-Feb-09	Sundar Babu & Ors	State of Tamil Nadu	498A quashed - Where a criminal proceeding is manifestly attended with mala fide and/or where the proceeding is maliciously instituted with an ulterior motive for wreaking vengeance on the accused and with a view to spite him due to private and personal grudge (http://indiankanoon.org/doc/1091787/)
10	Supreme Court	19-Feb-02	Shivcharan Lal Verma And Anr	State Of Madhya Pradesh	Annulled marriage does not attract 498a (http://indiankanoon.org/doc/145448/)
11	Kerela HC	3-Apr-09	BIJU VARGHESE	STATE OF KERALA	Annulled marriage does not attract 498a - a valid marriage is a precondition for an offence under Section 498A. (http://www.indiankanoon.org/doc/988644/)
12	Supreme Court	2 Feb 2011	Thota Venkateswarlu	State of A.P	Prior approval of Central Government needed under section 188 of Cr PC (http://ipc498a.wordpress.com/2011/09/06/sc-explains-section-188-thota-venkateswarlu-vs-state-of-a-p/)
13	Karnataka HC	15 April 2005	Pandurang Katti	State of Karnataka	498a dismissed – marital dispute was not on dowry (http://www.indiankanoon.org/doc/1379620/)
14	Supreme Court	13 April, 2004	Sakatar Singh	State Of Haryana	498a case quashed - Prosecution has not established allegation of demand - Based on erroneous inferences drawn on unproved facts and placing reliance on statements of interested witnesses trial court came to a wrong conclusion as to guilt of accused persons - High Court failed to notice its legal responsibility of discussing evidence independently and recording its findings on basis of such independent assessment of its own, because it is first court of appeal on facts (http://www.indiankanoon.org/doc/759010/)
15	Supreme Court	2 Sept 2011	Bhushan Kumar Meen	State Of Punjab & Ors	498a Quash - We are unable to agree with the reasoning of the learned Single Judge, since from the entire records available it is clear that the complaint made by the respondent No.2 did not make out a prima facie case to go to trial under Section 498-A IPC (http://indiankanoon.org/doc/1310509/)
16	Supreme Court	13 Aug 2010	Preeti Gupta	State Of Jharkhand	498 quash - The tendency of implicating husband and all his immediate relations is also not uncommon. The allegations of harassment of husband's close relations who had been living in different cities and never visited or rarely visited the place where the complainant resided would have an entirely different complexion. Before parting with this case, we would like to observe that a serious relook of the entire

					<p>provision is warranted by the legislation. It is also a matter of common knowledge that exaggerated versions of the incident are reflected in a large number of complaints. The tendency of over implication is also reflected in a very large number of cases.</p> <p>(http://indiankanoon.org/doc/46704/)</p>
17	Supreme Court	27 July 2009	Bhaskar Lal Sharma	Monica	<p>498a quashed - The object of the provision is prevention of the dowry menace. But as has been rightly contended by the petitioner many instances have come to light where the complaints are not bona fide and have been filed with oblique motive. In such cases acquittal of the accused does not in all cases wipe out the ignominy suffered during and prior to trial. Sometimes adverse media coverage adds to the misery. The question, therefore, is what remedial measures can be taken to prevent abuse of the well-intentioned provision. Merely because the provision is constitutional and intra vires, does not give a licence to unscrupulous persons to wreak personal vendetta or unleash harassment. It may, therefore, become necessary for the legislature to find out ways how the makers of frivolous complaints or allegations can be appropriately dealt with. Till then the courts have to take care of the situation within the existing framework. As noted above the object is to strike at the roots of dowry menace. But by misuse of the provision a new legal terrorism can be unleashed. The provision is intended to be used as a shield and not as an assassin's weapon</p> <p>The essential ingredients of the aforementioned provisions of 498a are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A woman must be married. 2. She must be subjected to cruelty. 3. Cruelty must be of the nature of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (i) any willful conduct as was likely to drive such woman: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. to commit suicide; b. cause grave injury or danger to her life, limb, either mental or physical; (ii) harassment of such woman, (1) with a view to coerce her to meet unlawful demand for property or valuable security, (2) or on account of failure of such woman or by any of her relation to meet the unlawful demand, (iii) woman was subjected to such cruelty by: (1) husband of that woman, or (2) any relative of the husband. <p>For constitution an offence under Section 498A of the IPC, therefore, the ingredients thereof must be held to be existing.</p>

					For proving the offence under Section 498A of the IPC, the complainant must make allegation of harassment to the extent so as to coerce her to meet any unlawful demand of dowry, or any willful conduct on the part of the accused of such a nature as is likely to drive the woman to commit suicide or to cause grave injury or danger to life, limb or health. We do not find any such allegation has been made or otherwise can be found out so as to enable us to arrive at an opinion that the appellants prima facie have committed such an offence. (http://indiankanoon.org/doc/1675377/)
18	Supreme Court	6 July 2009	Shakson Belthissor	State Of Kerala	It is thus established that on a reading of the FIR as also the charge sheet filed against the appellant no case under Section 498A is made out on the face of the record, and therefore, both the FIR as also the charge sheet are liable to be quashed in exercise of the powers under Section 482 of the CrPC. Clearly, the High Court failed to appreciate the facts in proper perspective, and therefore, committed an error on the face of the record. (http://indiankanoon.org/doc/437533/)
19	Supreme Court	24 April, 2009	Nepal Singh	State Of Haryana	498a quash - The reasoning of the High Court that something must have happened and otherwise deceased would not have committed suicide is clearly indefensible. (http://www.indiankanoon.org/doc/844758/)
20	Supreme Court	3 March, 2005	Ramesh	State Of Tamil Nadu	Transfer petition - In the view we are taking, it is not necessary for us to delve into the question of territorial jurisdiction of the Court at Trichy in detail. Suffice it to say that on looking at the complaint at its face value, the offences alleged cannot be said to have been committed wholly or partly within the local jurisdiction of the Magistrate's Court at Tricht. Prima facie, none of the ingredients constituting the offence can be said to have occurred within the local jurisdiction of that Court. Hence Trichy court has no jurisdiction over the case (http://indiankanoon.org/doc/1084013/)
21	Delhi HC	6 Aug, 2010	Amit Sharma	State and Ors	498a quash - When the counsel for State was asked how this FIR was registered in Delhi, the response of the State counsel as given in the form of brief synopsis is that while in India, the complainant and accused cohabited at Delhi at Kirti Nagar, which is the matrimonial house of complainant and therefore there was jurisdiction of Delhi court. The alleged offence admittedly had taken place in USA. All the accused persons, as mentioned by the complainant, are living in USA (http://www.indiankanoon.org/doc/1248996/)
22	Supreme Court	1 Nov, 2006	Manish Ratan	State Of M.P.	Offence under Section 498-A is not a continuing one and hence cruelty to bride at matrimonial

					home at Jabalpur will not grant jurisdiction to Datia Court, where, the bride came to reside ultimately (http://www.indiankanoon.org/doc/483265/)
23	Punjab HC	26 March 2010	Arun Kumar	Pinki Rani	498a Quash - there is no doubt that the cause of action arose in Etawah and the Court at Mansa had no jurisdiction to deal with the matter (http://indiankanoon.org/doc/1599420/)
24	Supreme Court		Savitaben Somabhai Bhatiya	State Of Gujarat	Wife refers to only LEGALLY married wife (http://www.lawyersclubindia.com/sc/Savitaben-Somabhai-Bhatiya-Vs-State-of-Gujarat-and-Ors--719.asp)
25	Delhi HC	12 Sept, 2007	Kanchan Gulati	The State And Ors	I consider that it is a rarest of rare case, where the Court should exercise its discretion. Criminal law can not be allowed to be used to settle the personal scores neither the Courts can be allowed to be used as tools. The complainant, who lost her divorce case in USA and was in USA all along from 1997 till 2002 and had not stayed with the petitioners, even for a single day. She lodged this FIR only to settle her personal scores. I, therefore, allow this petition. The FIR No. 277/2003 under Section 498A/406 IPC registered at Police Station New Friends Colony, Delhi is hereby quashed (http://www.indiankanoon.org/doc/1848315/)
26	UTTARAKHAND HC	12 Aug, 2011	Radha Kant Adhikari & Others	State of Uttaranchal & Another	HC: Far relatives implicated in 498A Falsely, Quashed against respondent 3 to 6 6. All told, the allegations made by the complainant Smt. Reena Adhikari in her complaint, do not, prima facie, inspire the confidence at least against the applicants no. 3 to 6, who are respectively mother-in-law, unmarried sister-in-law, younger brother-in-law and aunt (sister of her father-in-law) of the complainant. It appears to be highly improbable that these persons would accompany Radha Kant Adhikari (husband) and Anand Adhikari (father of Radha Kant Adhikar) and together abused and beat the complainant, that too at her parental house. Furthermore, Smt. Namita Adhikari is an old lady. Applicant no. 6 Smt. Sushma, who is aunt (Bua) of the complainant, is a married woman and she is living separately and she is not at all the beneficiary of demand of dowry. As such, applicants no. 3 to 6 appear to be falsely implicated being the relatives of the complainant and her husband. Hence, the impugned summoning order is liable to be quashed so far as it relates to the applicants no. 3 to 6. 7. For the reasons stated above, the present miscellaneous application under Section 482 CrPC is partly allowed. Impugned summoning order dated 15.12.2006, passed by the Judicial Magistrate, Khatima in Criminal Case No.

					1100/2006, is quashed only in respect of applicants no. 3 4 to 6, namely, Smt. Namita Adhikari, Km. Jayanti Adhikari, Dhruv Adhikari and Smt. Sushma, However, learned trial court shall proceed with the trial against the applicant no. 1 Radha Kant Adhikari and applicant no. 2 Anand Adhikari. Accordingly, interim order dated 29.11.2007 stands vacated so far as it relates to applicants no. 1 & 2. (http://www.indiankanoon.org/doc/443879/)
27	Delhi HC	14 Feb, 2011	Nitika Gauba	State & Ors.	HC: 498A misuse judgement In cases of matrimonial discord Section 498A/406 IPC are invariably invoked against every family member of husband, it becomes very difficult for the trial court to assess the truth of the allegations made by the complainant. Normally every complainant ropes in all relatives including the remote relatives living far away from the matrimonial home making stereotyped and similar allegations against everybody. This tendency of roping in every known relative including the minors in offences under Section 498A/406 IPC etc has in fact made these provisions introduced in Indian Penal Code, to prevent cruelty upon women, blunt. The gross misuse of these provisions for roping in every known relatives CrI.MC 2462/2010 Page 2 Of 3 of the husband poses a grave problem for the courts during trial and while deciding bail applications. Only oral statement of complainant and her parents is there in respect of cruelty and dowry demand, and normally there is no agreed list of articles given at the time of marriage Dowry Prohibition Act proved futile to bring to an end to the evil of dowry for this reason. Mere oral allegations of giving huge dowry without substantiating these allegations by bills of purchase of the articles or list prepared at the time of marriage and signed by both the parties cannot be given credence. Even those people, who have meager salaries or are hand to mouth, claim of giving huge amounts at the time of marriage. It is in the interest of both the parties that a list of dowry articles should be prepared by the parties at the time of marriage duly signed by both the parties. Though in this way, the evil of dowry cannot be curbed but it would curb the tendency of making astronomical claims later on just to rope in every member of the family of in laws as a criminal. (http://indiankanoon.org/doc/1956959/)
28	GUJARAT HC	04 Feb,	SHARDABEN	KUNTAL	498A Misuse judgement : Gujrat HC

		2011	BHIMJIBHAI KALANI & 6	KALPESHKU MAR KALANI & 1	The above attempt of initiating proceedings by the complainant is nothing but an abuse of process of law and is being undertaken with ulterior motive to see that all in-laws are being harassed. It is, therefore, submitted that keeping in view the decision of the State of Haryana v. Bhajan Lal [1992 SC 604], this complaint deserves to be quashed and set aside. (http://www.indiankanoon.org/doc/1811028/)
29	Delhi HC (Equivalent citations: I (2008) DLT 337)	01 Nov, 2007	Narender Kumar And Anr.	State (Govt. Of Nct Of Delhi)	Provisions of Section 498A are being used to convert failed marriages into a crime From the entire documents and the testimony of the witnesses I come to the conclusion that it is an unfortunate case where the complainant by making false statement implicated the entire family in offences of under Section 307 and 498A IPC. The Trial Court was not cautious enough to even look to admitted documents on record before convicting the family on mere statement of an estranged wife. (http://www.indiankanoon.org/doc/848122/)
30	Delhi HC (Equivalent citations: II (2007) DMC 644)	12 Sep, 2007	Kanchan Gulati And Anr.	The State And Ors.	498A cannot be used to settle her personal scores : Quashed by Delhi HC I consider that it is a rarest of rare case, where the Court should exercise its discretion. Criminal law can not be allowed to be used to settle the personal scores neither the Courts can be allowed to be used as tools. The complainant, who lost her divorce case in USA and was in USA all along from 1997 till 2002 and had not stayed with the petitioners, even for a single day. She lodged this FIR only to settle her personal scores. I, therefore, allow this petition. The FIR No. 277/2003 under Section 498A/406 IPC registered at Police Station New Friends Colony, Delhi is hereby quashed. (http://www.indiankanoon.org/doc/1848315/)
31	Delhi HC (Equivalent citations: 138 (2007) DLT 535)	02 Mar, 2007	Smt. Sangeeta Kalra	The State	Courts are being used as a tool in 498A-Justice Shiv Narayan Dhingra I consider that while framing charges, the Trial Court must take into account the entirety of the case, all documents which are brought to its notice including the correspondence between the parties and thereafter should decide whether there was case made out or the court was being used as a tool. I consider it is a fit case where criminal proceedings against the petitioner be quashed. I, therefore, hereby quash criminal proceedings against the petitioner under Sections 498A/406/34 IPC, in FIR No. 518/2000 Police Station Shalimar Bagh, Delhi. dusty. (http://indiankanoon.org/doc/909628/)

32	Delhi HC (Equivalent citations: I (2007) DMC 542)	21 Feb, 2007	Smt. Neera Singh	The State (Govt. Of Nct Of Delhi)	498A Quashed against minor Girls: Justice SN Dhingra Now-a-days, it has become a tendency to make vague and omnibus allegations against every member of the family of the husband, involving everybody under Section 498A and 406 of the IPC by making one or the other allegations. Hence, it has become very necessary for the Courts to carefully scrutinize the allegations and to find out if the allegations made really constitute the offence and meet the requirements of law at least prima facie. The learned ASJ scrutinized the entire FIR and the statement of complainant and there after observed that no case was made out against these two minor girls. I have also gone through the record and find that except above allegations made by the complainant, no other role was assigned to these two minor girls (respondents). (http://www.indiankanoon.org/doc/551325/)
33	KARNATAKA HC	03 Aug, 2010	P O Raju & Othrs	The State	Another Misuse Judgement from Karnataka HC (http://498amisuse.files.wordpress.com/2010/08/kar-hc-498amisuse.pdf)
34	BIHAR HC	23 Aug 2010	Bipat Mistry	The State	498A IPC misuse judgement from Patna High Court This case is an example that how the 2 provision under section 498A of the Indian Penal Code is misused. (http://498amisuse.wordpress.com/2010/08/23/498a-ipc-misuse-judgement-from-patna-high-court/)
35	SUPREME COURT	13 Aug, 2010	Preeti Gupta; Another	State of Jharkhand	Another Misuse acknowledge judgement from SC Admittedly, appellant no.1 is a permanent resident of Navasari, Surat, Gujarat and has been living with her husband for more than seven years. Similarly, appellant no.2 is a permanent resident of Goregaon, Maharashtra. They have never visited the place where the alleged incident had taken place. They had never lived with respondent no.2 and her husband. Their implication in the complaint is meant to harass and humiliate the husband's relatives. This seems to be the only basis to file this complaint against the appellants. Permitting the complainant to pursue this complaint would be an abuse of the process of law. The tendency of implicating husband and all his immediate relations is also not uncommon. At times, even after the conclusion of criminal trial, it is difficult to ascertain the real truth. The courts have to be extremely careful and cautious in dealing with these complaints and must take

					<p>pragmatic realities into consideration while dealing with matrimonial cases. The allegations of harassment of husband's close relations who had been living in different cities and never visited or rarely visited the place where the complainant resided would have an entirely different complexion. The allegations of the complaint are required to be scrutinized with great care and circumspection. Experience reveals that long and protracted criminal trials lead to rancour, acrimony and bitterness in the relationship amongst the parties. It is also a matter of common knowledge that in cases filed by the complainant if the husband or the husband's relations had to remain in jail even for a few days, it would ruin the chances of amicable settlement altogether. The process of suffering is extremely long and painful.</p> <p>34. Before parting with this case, we would like to observe that a serious relook of the entire provision is warranted by the legislation. It is also a matter of common knowledge that exaggerated versions of the incident are reflected in a large number of complaints. The tendency of over implication is also reflected in a very large number of cases.</p> <p>(http://indiankanoon.org/doc/46704/)</p>
36	ANDHRA HC	22 Nov, 2007	Kamireddy Mangamma And Others	State Of AP	<p>Another 498A IPC misuse Judgement</p> <p>Only in cases where, strong and authentic evidence like letters written by the accused-husband to the spouses or their parents etc., are available and where there is sufferance of serious injuries or death of the victim only, perhaps, it is desirable to refuse anticipatory bail, that, too, for the accused-husband.</p> <p>Another important aspect is in this type of cases; there is no chance of witnesses turning hostile or being influenced by the accused, as the witnesses would invariably be the kith-and-kin of the alleged victim like herself and her parents etc. These aspects have to be kept in view, while dealing with the cases of anticipatory bail/bail in cases of offences involving section 498-A IPC.</p> <p>(http://www.indiankanoon.org/doc/1952561/)</p>
37	BIHAR HC (Equivalent citations: I (2005) DMC 464, 2005 (2) JCR 378 Jhr)	20 Jan, 2004	Ram Lakhan Mandal And Ors.	State Of Bihar	<p>The death of a young lady is no doubt is a cause of concern but in holding conviction the Court should be cautious that section is not misused.</p> <p>(http://498amisuse.wordpress.com/2010/07/26/ram-lakhan-mandal-and-ors-vs-state-of-bihar-now-jharkhand-on-20-january-2004/)</p>
38	ALLAHABAD	05 Mar,	Rajeev Verma	State Of U.P.	The provision however has on occasion become an

	HC (Equivalent citations: 2004 CriLJ 2956, II (2004) DMC 76)	2004	And Ors.		instrument of misuse. Reports from the subordinate Courts indicate that entire families of the accused, including old women are languishing in jail for days till they are granted bail by the Sessions Courts or the High Court because Magistrates have become fearful of granting bail in these cases because of public outcry even though the case is only punishable with imprisonment up to three years. This on occasion results in the abdication of their powers by the Magistrate before the Police or the complainant. (http://indiankanoon.org/doc/1766858/)
39	Allahabad HC	27 May, 2005	Lalit Bhatia	State of Uttar Pradesh	I have gone through the entire records as well as supplementary affidavit and I feel that this is one of those cases in which the complaint has been filed only with a view to cause harassment to the husband and his family members. In fact it is gross misuse of the provisions of Section 498A I.P.C. which certainly pricks the judicial conscience and can not be left to stand. In the circumstances, I am in agreement with the argument advanced by counsel for the applicants that the continuation of the proceedings on the basis of complaint impugned in this application, is nothing short of an abuse of the process of the court and is liable to be quashed in exercise of inherent powers. I therefore, come to a conclusion that the complaint instituted by the opposite party No. 2 is frivolous one and is quashed The interim order directing for payment of Rs. 2000/- to Smt. Mamta Rani by the applicants is also discharged. The application is accordingly, allowed. (http://498amisuse.wordpress.com/2010/07/26/lalit-bhatia-son-of-sri-j-n-vs-state-of-uttar-pradesh-and-sri-on-27-may-2005/)
40	BIHAR HC	16 May, 2006	Brij Kishore Prasad	The State Of Bihar	Learned Counsel for the State has also fairly conceded that in such a case, proceeding ought to be quashed as the provisions of Section 498A of the Indian Penal Code cannot be allowed to be misused. (http://498amisuse.wordpress.com/2010/07/26/brij-kishore-prasad-sheojee-vs-the-state-of-bihar-on-16-may-2006/)
41	ASJ-II, Rohini, DELHI	26 Jul, 2010	Uma Devi	Sunil Garg & Others	then it is necessary for the courts of the Ld. Magistrates to bring these facts to the notice of the government authorities including the Income Tax authority so that not only the sources of the income of the person allegedly giving dowry but also the correctness of the allegations with regard to giving dowry are got verified and both the giver and the taker are brought to law.

					<p>This being so, all subordinate courts are bound by the aforesaid directions and are under an obligation to get an inquiry conducted and bring these facts to the notice of the Government Authorities particularly the Income Tax authorities. (http://legalthan498adowrymisuse.blogspot.in/2010/07/charge-wife-and-family-for-giving-dowry.html)</p>
42	Delhi HC	21 Dec, 2009	CHANDER KANTA LAMBA & ORS	STATE & ORS.	<p>I cannot refrain from mentioning that in a case of this nature, the Court has to be very sensitive and it should not get swayed by emotions which the complainant may be suffering from with a view to put persons or relatives who are totally unconnected with the incident to the facing of the trial in itself in present times is a great deal of punishment especially in the light of the fact that the same CrI.Rev. P.No.267/2008 Page 11 of 12 continues endlessly for years together on account of heavy load on the learned MM. (http://www.indiankanoon.org/doc/989322/)</p>
43	UTTARAKHAND HC	16 Jul, 2010	State of Uttarakhand	Nishikant	<p>The legislature enacted the provision of section 304-B IPC and section 113-B of the Indian Evidence Act, to deal with social evil of dowry, however, sometimes it is seen that these provisions are more pronounced in their misuse and there is general tendency to implicate husband or his relatives after death of the wife takes place. (http://www.indiankanoon.org/doc/1993968/)</p>
44	KARNATAKA HC	06 Jun, 2011	Santosh S/O Kallappa Kalaskar	State of Karnataka	<p>498A Quash (http://498amisuse.files.wordpress.com/2012/02/crlp15356-11-06-06-20111.pdf)</p>
45	COMPILATION				<p>http://498amisuse.wordpress.com/2010/02/17/498amisuse-judgements/</p>