

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

CRM No.M-341 of 2015

Date of Decision: 6.2.2015

Mannu Sachdeva

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MEHINDER SINGH SULLAR

Present: Mr.Jagmohan Singh Ghuman, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr.Naveen Sheoran, DAG Haryana for the State.

Mr.Sunil Chadha, Senior Advocate with
Ms.Arti Kaur, Advocate for the complainant.

MEHINDER SINGH SULLAR , J. (Oral)

Petitioner Mannu Sachdeva s/o Jagdish Rai (brother-in-law) (Jeth), has preferred the instant petition for the grant of concession of regular bail, in a case registered against him along with his brother & main co-accused, namely, Vikram Sachdeva (husband) and Vijay Sachdeva (mother-in-law) of Payal (deceased), daughter of complainant Subhash Chander (for brevity “the complainant”), vide FIR No.288 dated 7.5.2014 (Annexure P1), on accusation of having committed the offences punishable under sections 498-A and 306 read with section 34 IPC by the police of Police Station Sector 10, Gurgaon.

2. Notice of the petition was issued to the State.
3. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, going through the record with their valuable help and after deep consideration over the entire matter, to my mind, the present petition for regular bail deserves to be accepted in this context.

4. Precisely, the prosecution, inter-alia, claimed that the marriage of Payal, daughter of the complainant was solemnized with Vikram Sachdeva (main accused) on 1.11.2003 at Delhi, more than 10½ years prior to the present occurrence. The petitioner and his other co-accused were stated to have treated her with cruelty in connection with and on account of demand of dowry. She committed suicide and it was alleged that the accused abetted the crime in dispute. Petitioner is brother -in-law (Jeth) of the deceased. All the main allegations of cruelty in connection with & on account of demand of dowry are assigned to main accused Vikram Sachdeva, brother of petitioner and husband of the deceased (non-petitioner). Very vague and general allegations of cruelty in this relevant connection are assigned to the present petitioner. Even from the bare perusal of the contents of the FIR, as to whether the penal provision of section 306 IPC is attracted to the facts, relatable to the case of petitioner, or not, inter-alia, would be a moot point to be decided during the course of trial after receipt of evidence of parties by the trial Court.

5. Be that as it may, the petitioner was arrested on 14.5.2014. Since then, he is in judicial custody and no useful purpose would be served to further detain him in jail. There is no history of his previous involvement in any other criminal case. The final conclusion of trial will naturally take a long time.

6. In the light of aforesaid reasons, taking into consideration the totality of the facts & circumstances, emanating from the record, as depicted here-in-above and without commenting further anything on merits, lest it may prejudice the case of either side, during the course of trial of main case, the instant petition for regular bail is accepted. The petitioner is ordered to

be released on bail on his furnishing adequate bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

7. Needless to mention that, nothing observed here-in-above, would reflect on the merits in the trial of main case, in any manner, as the same has been so recorded for the limited purpose of deciding the present petition for regular bail only.

(Mehinder Singh Sullar)
Judge

6.2.2015
AS