

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

**CRM No. M-19373 of 2017
Date of decision: 26.05.2017**

Suman Lata

...Petitioner

Versus

Shamsher Singh and others

...Respondents

CORAM:HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RITU BAHRI

Present: Mr. Kamal Sehgal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ritu Bahri, J.

This petition has been filed against the order dated 09.01.2017 passed by the Additional Sessions Judge, Panchkula, allowing the revision filed by respondent Nos. 1 to 4 and setting aside the order dated 11.11.2016 passed by the Judicial Magistrate, Ist Class, Panchkula, whereby they (respondent Nos. 1 to 4) had been summoned to face trial under Section 498-A IPC pursuant to an application filed by the prosecution under Section 319 Cr.P.C.

The petitioner-complainant intends to summon her father-in-law, mother-in-law, brother-in-law and his wife as additional accused to face the trial. During investigation, they were kept in column No.2 of the report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. in view of the fact that they were staying in a separate rental accommodation. A perusal of FIR (Annexure P-2) shows that petitioner-complainant has alleged that after few days of marriage, her in-laws started demanding more dowry. For the purpose of summoning of accused under Section 319 Cr.P.C. more than *prima facie* evidence has to

exist because the accused are to be summoned to face a criminal trial. Keeping in view that complainant-petitioner was staying in separate accommodation, allegations of harassment against her in-laws seems to be general in nature.

In the light of above discussion, having examined the impugned order, no illegality, much less perversity, has been found therein warranting interference by this Court.

Dismissed.

26.05.2017
ajp

(RITU BAHRI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No