

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Crl. Misc. No. M-40364 of 2013

Date of decision : 23.02.2016

Harbans Singh

..... Petitioner

versus

Gurpinder Jit Singh and others

... Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANITA CHAUDHRY

**Present: Mr. Rahul Vats, Advocate
for the petitioner**

ANITA CHAUDHRY, J. (ORAL)

Karamjit Kaur had filed a complaint against six persons. The trial Magistrate summoned Sukhjit Hundal, Surender Singh and Harjit Kaur and dismissed the complaint qua Gurpinder Jit Singh and Sukhwant Kaur - Jeth and Jethani. Aggrieved by the order a revision was filed against the summoning order which has been dismissed by the Addl. Session Judge, Sirsa on 04.07.2013. Still aggrieved this petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C.

Some more facts are necessary. The complainant's daughter was married to Sukhjit Hundal. After few months of marriage Sukhjit left for Germany. After few months Karamjit Kaur had also gone to Germany but stayed there for a brief period and returned. The allegations were that she had been thrown out of the house. Karamjit then lodged the FIR in April 2004 but a cancellation report was submitted and thereafter it is the father who had filed a complaint.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner at length.

The allegations made in the complaint are contained in para 5 of the complaint wherein it had been pleaded that Jeth and Jethani had asked

Karamjit Kaur to bring money in order to enable them to purchase the tickets and to pay for visa fees. It had also been urged that thereafter Karamjit Kaur went abroad and returned from Germany and she was locked and was beaten up. The allegations were levelled that the mother-in-law, father-in-law, Jeth and Jethani demanded Rs. 5 lacs for repaying the loan.

No date or month was indicated in the complaint. There were no allegations of entrustment. The trial Magistrate on the basis of the statement given by the complainant summoned only the husband and his parents. Aggrieved with the order the Revisional Court examined the evidence and found that the allegations were vague qua the two and there were no overt act attributed to Jeth and Jethani nor it was alleged that there was any entrustment. The revision was dismissed.

I have gone thorough the allegations contained in the complaint as well as the statement made by the girl before the trial Court. I find no merit in the petition. The Court below had examined the material that was placed before it. There is no illegality nor mis-appreciation of evidence.

The petition is dismissed in limine.

February 23, 2016

reena

**(ANITA CHAUDHRY)
JUDGE**