

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.29360 of 2015
Date of decision: 28.03.2017

Sukhvir Kaur

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RITU BAHRI

Present:- Mr. Deepak Aggarwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Jaspreet Sekhon, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Divyadeep Walia, Advocate
for respondents No.2 and 3.

RITU BAHRI, J. (ORAL)

The present petition has been filed under Section 482, Cr.P.C. for quashing of the order dated 09.07.2015 (Annexure P-6) passed by the Additional Sessions Judge, Bathinda whereby a revision filed by respondents No.2 and 3 against the order dated 03.06.2014 (Annexure P-4) passed by Judicial Magistrate First Class, Bathinda has been allowed. Vide order dated 03.06.2014, JMFC, Bathinda summoned the respondents No.2 and 3 as additional accused on an application under Section 319, Cr.P.C.

A bare perusal of the statement of Sukhvir Kaur (Annexure P-2) shows that the sufficient dowry articles were given to the respondents and accused-respondents had agreed to return the same on demand. As per allegations in the FIR, consistent demand for car was made. During investigation, respondent No.2-Sardara Singh, father-in-law and respondent No.3-Bachan Kaur, mother-in-law were found innocent and kept in column

No.2 by the Police.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record.

Learned Additional Sessions Judge, Bathinda has rightly discharged respondents No.2 and 3 from facing trial as additional accused, as respondents No.2 and 3 would not be the beneficiaries of the car.

In view of all that has been discussed above, there is no illegality or infirmity in the order passed by the Additional Sessions Judge, Bathinda, that requires interference of this Court.

Therefore, the revision petition stands dismissed.

28.03.2017
Dinesh Bansal

(RITU BAHRI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes / No

Whether Reportable

Yes / No