

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

CRM M-6734 of 2015

Date of decision : 17.08.2015

Deepak Narula & anr.

....Petitioners

V/s

State of Punjab & anr.

....Respondents

BEFORE : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJAN GUPTA

Present: Mr. D.D. Sharma, Advocate for the petitioners.

RAJAN GUPTA J.

Petitioners have filed this petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. seeking quashing of FIR No. 107 dated 24.09.2014 registered under Sections 498A, 506, 323 IPC at Police Station Women Cell, Ludhiana, District Ludhiana.

Learned counsel has emphasized that earlier there was a compromise between the parties. However, same remains unsuccessful. All inquiries were in favour of the petitioners. Thus, FIR deserves to be quashed.

Notice of motion.

On the last date of hearing, Mr. Shilesh Gupta, Addl. A.G. Punjab was asked to assist the court. He has opposed the prayer. According to him, inquiries pertain to the period before registration of FIR. Thus, there is no ground to quash the proceedings.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

FIR was lodged by Preeti Narula wife of petitioner no. 1.

She alleged that her marriage was solemnized on 23.11.2008 at

Ludhiana as per Hindu Rites. After marriage, complainant and petitioner no. 1 live together at Ludhiana for some time. One female child was born out of the wedlock. Sufficient dowry articles were given at the time of marriage. However, after some time, accused started taunting the complaint and demanded cash amounting to ₹10.00 lacs. Their demands increased with the passage of time. Complainant was also given severe beatings for bringing less dowry. On 05.06.2010, accused mercilessly beat up the complainant on account of demand of ₹10.00 lacs. Accused were also not happy with the complainant due to birth of the female child. Complainant was also subjected to domestic violence. In this respect her medico legal examination was also conducted at Civil Hospital, Ludhiana. Keeping in view nature of allegations, I am of the considered view that no case for quashing of FIR is made out. Needless to observe that it is not possible for this court to form an opinion unless some evidence comes forth before the trial court. There is, thus, no ground to interfere in inherent jurisdiction. Dismissed.

August 17, 2015

Ajay

(RAJAN GUPTA)
JUDGE