

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

**CRM-M No. 1822 of 2017(O&M)**

**Date of decision: 23.1.2017**

Ramadhar Kumar

....Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE REKHA MITTAL**

Present: Mr. Tushar Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

\*\*\*\*\*

**REKHA MITTAL, J.(Oral)**

The petitioner prays for grant of pre-arrest bail in FIR No.528 dated 13.09.2016 registered at Police Station Civil Lines Gurgaon, District Gurgaon for offence punishable under Sections 498-A, 304-B read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (in short 'IPC').

Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that marriage of the petitioner with the deceased was performed in June 2014 and the deceased stayed with the petitioner only for a period of 3 months. For the remaining period, she either stayed in her parental home or at native village of the petitioner. The victim (deceased) was having behavioral problem due to which several times, she locked herself in the room for 2-3 days at a stretch and in regard thereof, the petitioner had informed the brother and paternal uncle (Chacha) of the victim through messages sent on the mobile phone but probably as they were aware of behavioral history of the deceased, they did not take it seriously. The petitioner is highly qualified i.e. Ph.D. and is a Scientist. He is ready to join investigation and co-operate throughout.

I have heard counsel for the petitioner, perused the paper-book particularly the allegations raised in the FIR.

Indisputably, the victim died an unnatural death while staying with the petitioner-husband at Gurgaon. She died within three years of her marriage. There is nothing on record suggestive of the fact that the petitioner ever got the victim examined from a doctor with regard to alleged problem of her behaviour. The petitioner is the best person to explain the facts especially within his knowledge as to why the victim took the extreme step to eliminate herself at a young age. Taking into consideration gravity of charge coupled with that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for progress of investigation, I do not think it to be fit case wherein the petitioner deserves to be allowed concession of pre-arrest bail.

For the foregoing reasons, the petition fails and is accordingly dismissed.

**JANUARY 23, 2017**

‘D. Gulati’

**(REKHA MITTAL)**

**JUDGE**

|                           |   |        |
|---------------------------|---|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | : | yes/no |
| Whether reportable        | : | yes/no |