

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M -44127 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of decision: 21.07.2017

Ranvir and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. R.N. Singal, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Ms. Mahima Yashpal, AAG, Haryana
assisted by ASI Chajjo Ram.

Mr. J.S. Hooda, Advocate for respondent No.2.

Jitendra Chauhan, J. (Oral)

By filing the present petition under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the petitioners have sought anticipatory bail in FIR No.0010 dated 22.09.2015, registered under Sections 377, 498-A, 323, 406, 506 read with Section 34 of IPC, at Women Police Station, Palwal, District Palwal.

It is contended that petitioners are father in-law and mother in-law of the complainant. Only general and vague allegations of demand of dowry have been levelled against them in the FIR. In pursuance of order dated 24.12.2015, the petitioners have joined the investigation.

On the other hand, the learned State counsel, on instructions states that though the petitioners have joined the investigation, however, there are direct allegations of demand of dowry against the petitioners.

Heard.

The petitioners are parents in-law of the complainant/respondent No.2. There are specific allegations against the petitioners of beatings and demand of dowry. Petitioner No.1 was heard in person and an offer was made to settle the matter. The petitioners, in the face of the Court, changed stance and ultimately offered an alimony of Rs. 4 lakh for the complainant and her two daughters.

On 11.03.2016, the following order was passed:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioners, on instructions from petitioner No.1-Ranvir submits that out of total land of 8 acres, 1/7th part comes in the share of each party and he is ready to give that share to his both daughters-in-law.

Adjourned to 28.03.2016.

Interim order to continue”.

After making the statement on 11.03.2016, the petitioners in the garb of settlement has not done anything to materialize the promises. It has also come on record that while family of the complainant had gone to the house of the petitioners to resolve the matter, they were attacked and their vehicle was smashed. The petitioners were enlarged on interim bail on 24.12.2015 and have been continuously assuring the Court to settle the issue. Keeping in view the conduct and the fact that the petitioners have repeatedly changed stance in the face of the Court and have failed to resolve the matter after they were admitted to bail and considering the specific allegations of demand of dowry and beatings, no

case for pre-arrest bail is made out at this stage.

Dismissed.

Anything said herein above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

21.07.2017

sumit.k

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

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