

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

CRR No.2104 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of Decision: September 26, 2016

Anita

.....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RITU BAHRI

Present:- S.P.Chahar, Advocate, for the petitioner.

RITU BAHRI, J. (ORAL)

CRM-18897-2015

For the reasons mentioned in the application, delay of 24 days in filing the appeal is condoned.

CRM stands disposed of.

CRR No.2104 of 2015

This revision petition has been filed against the impugned orders dated 01.03.2013 and 03.12.2014 passed by learned trial Court and learned appellate Court respectively vide which the learned trial Court had acquitted the respondent No.2 and 3 in FIR No.498-A, 406, 506 IPC.

As per allegations in the FIR, prosecutrix namely Anita was married with accused Naveen Sharma on 28.04.1996. After 6 months of marriage, her husband started pressing the demand of dowry and used to give beatings to her. On 08.09.1999 a female child was born out. The accused demanded Rs.20,000/-, which was given him by cash Rs.10,000/- and other articles by the family of the petitioner. Despite that the accused

were not satisfied and they further started pressing their demand of motor

cycle. On dated 28.03.2001, another female child was born and at that occasion also the accused pressed their demand whereupon Rs.10,000/- were given by the parents of the prosecutrix. The accused at that time had beaten the prosecutrix by causing grievous injuries upon her hand. Rs.50,000/ were further paid by the parents of the petitioner to the accused on 20.03.2002 but the accused failed to mend their ways. The accused thrown away the petitioner from her matrimonial house on 17.05.2003 and third female child was born out by the petitioner at her parental house.

Both the Courts below have acquitted the accused on the ground that prosecution has failed to prove beyond all reasonable doubt the essential ingredients of cruelty against the husband of the petitioner. The petitioner had left her matrimonial house on 17.05.2013 and after the third baby was born to her at her parental house.

Keeping in view of the above and considering the fact that no evidence was led by the petitioner also before this Court to show that the aforesaid offences were made out by her husband-respondents, this revision petition is again dismissed as such.

September 26, 2016
anil

(RITU BAHRI)
JUDGE