

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Crl. Misc. No. M-13450 of 2015

Date of decision : 18.02.2016

Om Parkash

..... Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANITA CHAUDHRY

Present: Mr. K.B. Raheja, Advocate for the petitioner

ANITA CHAUDHRY, J. (ORAL)

Learned counsel for the petitioner at the outset states that in the Memo of Parties father's name of the petitioner had been wrongly mentioned as Om Parkash and name of the father of Om Parkash is Shila Ram.

Registry is directed to correct the Memo of Parties.

The instant petition is for quashing of FIR No. 94 dated 28.02.2014 filed under Sections 498-A/323/34 IPC registered at Police Station Sadar Dadhari, District Bhiwani.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that petitioner is the father-in-law and he was living in a separate accommodation and he had a separate ration card and had no concern with the matrimonial dispute of the complainant. The counsel had referred to copy of the ration card (Annexures P-2 and P-3). He further state that challan has been presented and charge has been framed last year and the trial is going on. The counsel has sought support from ***Arnesh Kumar vs. State of Bihar and another, 2014(3) RCR (Criminal) 527, Jaspal Singh and another vs. State of Punjab and another, 2011(3) RCR (Criminal) 190, Sanjiv Kumar vs. State of Haryana and another, 2012(3) RCR (Criminal) 87 and Krishan Lal and others vs. State of Haryana and another, 2013(7) RCR (Criminal) 1863.***

Dealing with the judgments referred to by the petitioner, I find none of them are applicable to the facts of the present case. The FIR contains allegations of demand of dowry. The police had investigated the case and had filed the challan, charge has been framed. The trial is going on.

No case for quashing is made out.

The petition is dismissed in limine.

February 18, 2016

reena

**(ANITA CHAUDHRY)
JUDGE**