

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

**CRR-1729-2017 (O&M)
Date of decision: 08.05.2017**

Raghubir

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM:HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RITU BAHRI

Present: Mr. J.P. Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ritu Bahri, J.

This petition has been filed against the order dated 09.02.2017 passed by the Additional Sessions Judge (Exclusive Court), Bhiwani, whereby application filed by the prosecution under Section 319 Cr.P.C. for summoning Mahabir, Anil, Babita and Krishan (respondent Nos.2 to 5) as additional accused, has been dismissed.

Marriage of Reena, daughter of complainant-petitioner, was solemnized with Sunil on 08.12.2013. On 14.09.2016, she made a telephone call to Parveen son of complainant and asked him to take her back as her in-laws were demanding more dowry. Thereafter, on 15.09.2016, they came to know that Reena had died in village Jamalpur. On inquiry, they came to know that Reena had died in General Hospital, Hansi. In this background, the FIR was registered.

As per allegations in the FIR, father-in-law of deceased had

demanded Rs.50,000/- in cash, mother-in-law demanded gold chain, sister-in-law (*jethani*) demanded gold ring and brother-in-law (*jeth*) had demanded Rs.20,000/- and one buffalo. After investigation, respondent Nos. 2 to 5 were found innocent and challan has been presented against Sunil and Guddi i.e. husband and mother-in-law of deceased.

The trial Court has dismissed the application by taking into account initially statement (Ex.PW1/A) made by the complainant to the police. In this statement, no specific role had been assigned to the accused-respondents, who have now been sought to be summoned. Rather, the allegations against them were general in nature. The same facts had been reiterated by the complainant while appearing as PW-1. The general allegations cannot be a ground to summon the additional accused to face trial. Learned counsel for the petitioner is not able to point out any evidence, which the prosecution had ignored at the time of presentation of challan against the main accused.

Having examined the impugned order, no ground is made out to interfere therein.

Dismissed.

08.05.2017
ajp

(RITU BAHRI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No