

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

**CRR-165 of 2015**

**Date of Decision: 18.11.2016**

**Vijay Lata**

**.....Petitioner**

**Vs.**

**State of Haryana and Others**

**.....Respondents**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RITU BAHRI**

**Present:-** Mr.Ashwani Gaur, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Ms.Mahima Yashpal, AAG, Haryana.

Mr.S.K.Panwar, Advocate, for respondent Nos.2 to 6.

**\*\*\*\*\***

**RITU BAHRI, J. (ORAL)**

The petitioner has come up in the revision petition against the order dated 22.09.2014 which should be set aside and judgment of trial Court dated 11.05.2012 be restored.

A perusal of the judgment passed by the lower appellate Court shows that appellants No.2 and 4 Tej Bahadur and Janak are the brothers-in-law (Dewar and Jeth respectively) of the complainant, appellant No.3 Smt.Kunta @ Sakuntla is her mother-in-law and appellant No.5 Geeta is the sister-in-law (Jethani) of the complainant. All of them have taken a stand that they were living separately from the complainant and her husband in Village Gulabad whereas the complainant was residing at Palwal. In order to prove this fact, the accused have examined two witnesses in their defence evidence. Bhim Singh, who is Lambardar of the village has been examined as DW-1 who deposed that except Satya Parkash, all other accused were living in the village and they had house and landed property in the village.

Though this witness had been cross-examined at length by the prosecution, but nothing incriminating in favour of the prosecution evidence. Second witness examined by the appellants was Yaad Ram, who was a Member Panchayat at Village Gulabad. This witness has also deposed that except appellant Satya Parkash, all the other accused are residing in Village Gulabad and they have their house and landed property there. This witnesses was also cross-examined at length but nothing could be extracted from the same also. On the basis of abovesaid deposition, appellants Tej Bahadur, Kunta @ Shakuntla, Janak and Geeta had been acquitted from the charges levelled against them. This finding has been recorded by the learned appellate Court on the basis of judgments given by the Hon'ble High Court recently in cases of **Mukesh Rani Vs. State of Haryana 2002 (1) RCR (Criminal) 163 P&H** and **Maya Vs. Sudesh 2000 (1) RCR (Criminal) 356** and so far as the appeal qua Satya Parkash, husband of the complainant, is concerned, the appellant Court had not found merits in the impugned order and there were no infirmity in the impugned judgment of conviction as there are clear allegations of cruelty on account of demand of dowry and misappropriation of dowry articles. However, on the quantum of sentence imposed upon appellant Satya Parkash, he had also suffered the agony of a protracted trial for the last about ten years, the learned appellate Court modified the order of sentence dated 12.05.2012 and reduced the rigorous imprisonment from two years to one year and also ordered that all the sentences are to run concurrently.

In the light of the abovesaid discussion, the order of the learned appellate Court does not reflect any material illegality, irregularity or perversity which warrant any interference. Hence, the present revision is

dismissed.

(RITU BAHRI)  
JUDGE

18.11.2016  
*anil*

|                                  |               |
|----------------------------------|---------------|
| <i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i> | <i>Yes/No</i> |
| <i>Whether reportable</i>        | <i>Yes/No</i> |