

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

**CRM No.M-9154 of 2016
Date of Decision: April 07, 2016**

Sumitra and others **Petitioners**

vs.

State of Haryana **Respondent**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: Mr. S.K. Verma, Advocate for the petitioners.

- 1. Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers may be allowed to see the judgment?*
- 2. To be referred to the Reporters or not?*
- 3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?*

Kuldip Singh J.(Oral)

Petitioners seek quashing of FIR No.203, dated 16.10.2015, under Sections 306, 406 read with Section 34 IPC, registered at Police Station Nathusari Chopta. The petitioners also seek quashing of the order dated 23.02.2016 (Annexure P-11) passed by learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Sirsa, vide which the petitioners were charge-sheeted for the commission of offence punishable under Section 306 read with Section 34 IPC.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners and have also carefully gone through the case file.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has stated that in this case, one Vinod Kumar committed suicide. In the suicide note, he named his wife and her paramour Raj Kumar. The present petitioners were also named in the said suicide note. It is stated that from the suicide note, no abetment to suicide is made out.

It comes out that at the time of framing of the charges, the court is to see the case from a very narrow compass. Mere suspicion is sufficient to frame the charges. In this case, there is a suicide note. Earlier also, the petitioners approached this Court by way of filing CRM-M No.3666 of 2016, which was decided vide order dated 02.02.2016 with a direction to the lower court to pass a speaking order on the question of framing of charges. Now, the speaking order has been passed. As many as 10 authorities have been considered by the lower court and it was held that there was sufficient ground to frame the charges.

At this stage, this Court would not like to comment upon the merits of the case, which is likely to prejudice the rights of the parties. The statements of the witnesses are yet to be weighed by the lower court.

It being so, there is no ground to interfere in the impugned order of framing charges against the present petitioners. Consequently, there is no ground to quash the FIR.

Accordingly, the present petition stands dismissed.

April 07, 2016
sarita

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE