

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Crl. Revision No. 628 of 2016
Date of decision : 14.07.2016

Gurdeep Singh Sohi

... Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANITA CHAUDHRY

Present: Mr. A.D.S. Sukhija, Advocate
for the petitioner

ANITA CHAUDHRY, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner is aggrieved of the order dated 20.01.2016 passed by Addl. Sessions Judge, Ambala who dismissed the application filed under Section 319 Cr.P.C. and refused to summon the additional accused.

It would be necessary to first give the facts.

Jasbir Kaur was married to Sukhjiwan in December 2012. The couple had two children. The unfortunate occurrence took place in November 2014. The deceased committed suicide by jumping in front of the train. The complainant had named the husband, mother-in-law, sister-in-law and brother-in-law. The police had challaned only the husband. The trial had commenced. The complainant had examined himself and he named the other relatives. The names were contained in the FIR. Thereafter an application under Section 319 Cr.P.C. was moved which was considered and was dismissed.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner at length and have gone through the documents placed on record.

A perusal of the FIR shows that allegations against the Jeth, Jethani and mother-in-law were that they used to trouble her and mentally harass her. No specific instances were narrated. The deceased was a teacher. She had left the house and her scooter was found near the railway track. A resignation letter was also found in the scooter. The accused had handed over a suicide note wherein there was one line statement that no one was to be blamed for her death. The counsel had conceded that the letter was sent for comparison and they had got it compared with the material taken from the Educational Institute where she was teaching and the writing had matched.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that the letter was handed over by the in-laws side about two months after the incident.

At the present stage we are only concerned with the allegations against the additional accused named by the complainant. There is one line statement that they used to trouble and harass her. At the trial the complainant could not give any specific instance and, therefore, the trial Court had rightly dismissed the application. The prosecution had been unable to indicate the complicity of other persons.

There is no merit in this petition and is dismissed.

July 14, 2016
reena

(ANITA CHAUDHRY)
JUDGE