

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH**

**Criminal Misc. No. M-23233 of 2015  
Date of Decision: 21.08.2015**

Simarjeet Kaur @ Mati

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent(s)

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA**

1. *Whether reporters of local newspapers may be allowed to see judgment?*
2. *To be referred to reporters or not?*
3. *Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?*

Present:- Mr. Hardev Singh, Advocate for  
Mr. Siddharth Gupta, Advocate  
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Gurinderjit Singh, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Manpreet Sindh Sidhu, Advocate  
for the complainant.

\*\*\*\*\*

**HARI PAL VERMA J.(Oral)**

Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 438 CrPC is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.19 dated 12.3.2015 under Sections 304-B, 498-A, 506, 148, 149 IPC (Sections 148 and 149 IPC deleted later on) registered at Police Station Sadar Rampura, District Bathinda.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner was married in the year 2011 and is sister-in-law (Nanad) of the deceased Veerpal Kaur. She is staying in her in-laws house

along with her child.

Mr. Manpreet Singh Sidhu, Advocate, appearing on behalf of the complainant, submits that in fact the petitioner had a matrimonial dispute at the relevant time and she was staying in the matrimonial home of Veerpal Kaur.

On the other hand, learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Nachhattar Singh, submits that there are specific allegations of demand of dowry against the petitioner.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

Reference may be made to judgments of Hon'ble the Apex Court in the cases of **Kans Raj v. State of Punjab** 2000(2) RCR(Cr) 6969 and **Major Singh v. State of Punjab AIR 2015 SC 2081**. The relevant observations made by Hon'ble the Apex Court in the case of **Kans Raj v. State of Punjab** (*supra*) read as under:-

*“.....For the fault of the husband, the in-laws or the other relations cannot, in all cases, be held to be involved in the demand of dowry. In cases where such accusations are made, the overt acts attributed to persons other than husband are required to be proved beyond reasonable doubt. By mere conjectures and implications such relations cannot be held guilty for the offence relating to dowry deaths. A tendency has, however, developed for roping in all relations of the in-laws of the deceased wives in the matters of dowry deaths which, if not discouraged, is likely to affect the case of the prosecution even against the real culprits.”*

Considering the fact that the petitioner is sister-in-law (*Nanad*) of the deceased and there is little scope for her to demand dowry, the petitioner deserves the concession of anticipatory bail. In the event of arrest of the petitioner, she shall be released on *ad interim* bail to the satisfaction of the arresting officer.

However, the petitioner shall continue to join investigation as and when directed by the Investigating Officer and shall abide by the terms and conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) CrPC.

August 21, 2015  
**AK**

**( HARI PAL VERMA )**  
**JUDGE**