

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

Crl. Misc. No.M-10678 of 2016

Date of Decision: 30.03.2016

Sumitra

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

....Respondent

BEFORE :- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE DAYA CHAUDHARY

- 1. Whether reporters of local newspapers may be allowed to see the judgment ? (Yes/No)**
- 2. To be referred to reporters or not ? (Yes/No)**
- 3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest ? (Yes/No)**

Present:- Mr. Nishant Raj, Advocate
for the petitioner.

DAYA CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)

This petition has been filed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.1547 dated 16.11.2015 registered under Sections 304-B/34 IPC (offence under Section 346 IPC was added later on) at Police Station City, Panipat, Tehsil and District Panipat, Haryana.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is 75 years of age and has falsely been implicated in the case. He further submits that no complaint was even made by the complainant prior to this incident. Nothing is to be recovered from the petitioner. Learned counsel also submits that except the present petitioner, no other family member is there to look after the minor son of the deceased.

Heard the arguments of learned counsel for the petitioner and have also perused the allegations levelled in the FIR as well as suicide

note.

The petitioner has specifically been named in the suicide note, left by the deceased. Simply on the ground that the petitioner is 75 years of age and nothing is to be recovered from her, anticipatory bail cannot be granted to her in case of offence under Section 304-B/34 IPC. The death has occurred within a period of seven years and it was an un-natural death.

Keeping in view the nature of allegations and offence, no ground is made out to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

The petition is accordingly dismissed.

30.03.2016
gurpreet

(DAYA CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE