

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

**CRM-M-19797 of 2015 (O&M)**  
**Date of Decision : 02.09.2015**

Ramesh Kaur

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R.P. NAGRATH**

1. *Whether Reporters of the local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?*
2. *To be referred to the Reporters or not?*
3. *Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest?*

Present: Mr. Sanjiv Gupta, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gazi Mohd., DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Pankaj Midda, Advocate  
for the complainant.

**R.P. Nagrath, J.**

Prayer in the instant petition is made under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail in FIR No. 318 dated 26.10.2013 for offences under Sections 304-B, 34, 406 and 498-A of Indian Penal Code (IPC), registered at Police Station Kotwali, Patiala.

Petitioner is the mother-in-law of the deceased. Marriage of the son of petitioner was solemnized on 18.03.2012 with Kanchan, who is stated to have died on 25.10.2013 under mysterious circumstances by hanging.

The prosecution story stated in the FIR is that the deceased was being harassed by her husband, sister-in-law and the petitioner, who is mother-in-law on one pretext or the other. In June, 2013, the husband of deceased demanded an amount of

₹ 10 lacs, thereupon an amount of ₹ 2.5 lacs was given to the petitioner in the presence of husband of the deceased. A phone call is also stated to have been made by the deceased to her mother on 25.10.2013. Priya wife of the complainant came to know about the phone call and called back the deceased. The deceased told wife of the complainant that the accused persons were demanding ₹ 7.5 lacs from her and if the demand is not met she would be killed.

This is a case in which a married woman died just within 1 years and 8 months of her marriage.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that daughter of the petitioner, who is also an accused, has since been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 28.08.2014 passed in CRM-M-25494 of 2014.

I am of the view that there cannot be any parity for the petitioner because of bail granted to sister-in-law of the deceased.

Learned State counsel also submitted that the prosecution evidence has since been closed and some defence witnesses have also been examined.

From the aforesaid discussion, I find the this is not a fit case to admit the petitioner to regular bail. Dismissed.

**September 02, 2015**  
jk

**( R.P. NAGRATH )**  
**JUDGE**