

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

**Crl. Rev. No.2514 of 2014 (O&M)
Date of decision : 29.11.2016**

Nidhi Dutta

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

Sohil and others

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANITA CHAUDHRY

Present: Mr. Balram Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

ANITA CHAUDHRY, J.

CRM-25057-2014

For the reasons set out in the application, same is allowed as prayed for and delay of 109 days in filing the revision is condoned.

Crl. Rev. No.2514 of 2014

The petitioner is aggrieved by the judgments of both the Courts below vide which the private respondents have been acquitted.

Nidhi Dutta was married to Sohel in 2006. The FIR was lodged in 2010. Allegations were made that there were demands of dowry and she was beaten up and her Istridhan had been mis-appropriated. The trial Court noted that the complainant admitted that she was kept nicely after marriage. The trial Court had noted that the complainant attempted to commit suicide by cutting her nerves and she had taken treatment in February, 2010.

Another attempt was made and she was treated at Ambe Hospital, Sahibabad. It was also noted that the complainant was getting salary which was deposited in her own account whereas the allegations made by the complainant were that her mother-in-law used to take her entire salary. It was noted that the father-in-law purchased a Kinetic Honda Scooter in the name of the complainant. The accused had produced record to show that the complainant had inflicted the injury upon herself. Considering the evidence, the trial Court had acquitted the accused.

Aggrieved by the judgment, the complainant filed an appeal, which was dismissed. The appellate Court had elaborately dealt with the evidence and had noted the fact that all was well and there were celebrations when the daughter was born. Ample material was produced on the record to show that the festivals were celebrated and the complainant appeared to be in a jovial mood in the photographs. The complaints started some time in February, 2010 and after four years of the marriage the allegations of demand of dowry and maltreatment cropped up. The appellate Court in paras. 20 & 21 of the judgment had elaborately dealt with the evidence and I find no infirmity in the findings recorded by both the Courts below.

There is no merit in the revision and is dismissed.

29.11.2016

Sunil

(ANITA CHAUDHRY)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No