

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

CRM-M-32555-2017

Date of decision-04.09.2017

Sarabjit Kaur

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Satvir Singh, Advocate for
Mr. A.S.Manaise, Advocate for the petitioner.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR No.70 dated 02.05.2017 (Annexure P-1) registered under Sections 498-A and 406 of Indian Penal Code at Police Station Sadar Hoshiarpur, District Hoshiarpur and subsequent proceedings arising therefrom.

It is contended that the petitioner is a married sister-in-law of the complainant/respondent No.2 and has been falsely implicated in the instant case. The petitioner never raised any demand of dowry and there is any allegation of entrustment. The settlement was arrived at between the parties on 22.08.2016 before the Women Cell, Hoshiarpur wherein it was agreed upon between the parties that the accused persons would give Rs.7.5 lakh and the parties would proceed to file a petition under Section 13-B of the Hindu Marriage Act. The petitioner is the widow of late Satnam Singh who served the Indian Army and died on duty on 27.02.2010 and is saddled with raising two children.

I have heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner and have gone through the case file.

From the perusal of the case file, it emerges that a complaint dated 24.06.2016 was moved by the complainant/respondent No.2 wherein she had levelled allegations against her in-laws family. The matter was inquired into by Women Police Station, Hoshiarpur and the petitioner along with her parents (in-laws of complainant/respondent No.2) were joined in the investigation wherein, they accepted all the allegations and submitted an apology in writing. It was further agreed that the petitioner and her parents would pay Rs.7.5 lakh to the complainant/respondent No.2. However, all these persons have backed out from the agreement reached and thus no payment has been made till date. The matter is still under investigation. The assertions raised by learned counsel for the petitioner pertain to the factual aspect of the matter which this Court is not inclined to go into at this stage.

The petition is accordingly dismissed.

September 04, 2017

vanita

**(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No