

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-22466 of 2017
Date of Decision: 19.07.2017

Krishna Devi

....Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

....Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURINDER GUPTA

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

Mr. Deepak Grewal, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. P.K. Ganga, Advocate
for the complainant.

SURINDER GUPTA, J.(Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Section 438 Code of Criminal Procedure for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 70 dated 10.05.2017 registered for the offence punishable under Section 304-B read with Section 34 of Indian Penal Code (for short 'IPC'), at Police Station Sadar Sirsa, District Sirsa.

Heard.

FIR in this case was registered on the statement of Darshan Singh, wherein he stated that her two daughters, namely, Neelam Rani and Saroj Rani are married with two brothers, namely, Lal Chand and Harbans Lal. The petitioner and her husband were harassing them on the ground that they have brought insufficient dowry and have defamed them in brotherhood on this score. They used to give beatings to both the daughters of complainant and number of *panchayats* were held to resolve the issue.

Lal Chand and Harbans Lal and the petitioner have been taking daughters of

complainant to their house with the assurance that they will not harass them in future. On 07.05.2017, complainant received a phone call of his younger daughter Saroj Rani that petitioner, her husband and Lal Chand have given beatings to her and Neelam Rani in the morning and they have taken their entire jewellery. Due to beating, Neelam Rani consumed some poisonous substance and was taken to R.K. Life Line Hospital, Sirsa by petitioner, her husband and Harbans Lal, where she died.

Allegations levelled against the petitioner have eye-witness account of Saroj Rani, younger sister of deceased, who is also married in that house. Usually evidence in such type of cases is circumstantial evidence but to the contrary this is a case based on direct evidence.

Keeping in view gravity of offence and nature of evidence against the petitioner, I find no reason to extend the benefit of grant of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner at this stage.

Dismissed.

July 19, 2017
jk

(SURINDER GUPTA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No