IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM NO. M-591 OF 2015 (O&M)
DECIDED ON : 27.01.2015

Sandeep @ Sandeep Vashist and another

...Petitioners

versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. C. PURI

Present : Mr. Gorakh Nath, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. Rajesh K. Sheoran, Addl. AG, Haryana.

K. C. PURI, J. (ORAL)

Sandeep @ Sandeep Vashist and Santosh have applied for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No. 62 dated 03.02.2014 under Sections 498-A/304-B/34 of the Indian Penal Code registered at Police Station City Rohtak, District Rohtak.

As per allegations of the prosecution, Pooja-deceased was married to Priyavart about two years ago prior to the occurrence. Petitioner No.1 is the brother-in-law (Jeth) and petitioner No.2 (Jethani) is the sister-in-law of deceased Pooja. The marriage took place on 17.06.2012. It is alleged that after three months of the marriage, Priyavart (husband), Sandeep

SHALINI BHATIA
2015.01.28 11:00
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document
High Court Chandigarh

(Jeth), Santosh (Jethani) and mother-in-law of the deceased started harassing her for dowry and they demanded ₹5 lacs and one Maruti Swift Car. On 24.11.2013, ₹1 lac was given to mother-in-law of deceased. It is further alleged that Sandeep (petitioner No.1) demanded ₹50,000/- in lieu of not giving him ring at the time of marriage. On 15.12.2013, ₹50,000/- was given to petitioner No.1. It is further alleged that Dharmo (mother-in-law) and Santosh (jethani/petitioner No.2) called the complainant on telephone and told that less dowry has been given and demanded Rs.1 lac for making gold ornaments. It is further alleged in the FIR that the deceased told the complainant that both the petitioners caught hold of her and her husband forcibly put some poison in her mouth.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that both the petitioners are Jeth and Jethani of the deceased and they have been summoned under Section 319 Cr.P.C. So, they are entitled to concession of anticipatory bail.

I have considered the said submissions but do not find any force in the same.

There are specific allegations against both the petitioners. The deceased specifically stated that both the petitioners caught hold her and her husband put some poisonous substance in her mouth. The death has taken place within seven years of marriage. There is persistant demand of dowry. The deceased died unnatural death. So, all the ingredients of Section

SHALINI BHATIA
2015.01.28 11:00
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document
High Court Chandigarh

304-B IPC have been fulfilled.

So, no ground for grant of anticipatory bail is made out.

Dismissed.

JANUARY 27, 2015 **(K. C. PURI)**
shalini **JUDGE**

SHALINI BHATIA
2015.01.28 11:00
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document
High Court Chandigarh