

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Acquittal Appeal No. 150 of 2014**

1. State of Chhattisgarh through the District Magistrate, Bilaspur, CG

---- Appellant**Versus**

1. Ramesh Kumar Jatwar son of Ramjhul, aged about 38 years,
2. Lalit Kumar Jatwar son of Ramjhul, aged about 34 years,
3. Smt. Shakuntala Bai Jatwar, wife of Ramjhul, aged about 65 years,
4. Ramjhul Jatwar, son of Daniram, aged about 70 years,

All R/o village Ghonghadih, PS Kota, District Bilaspur, CG

---- Respondents

For Appellant/State:	Shri Ravindra Agrawal, PL
For Respondent/accused:	Shri Vimlesh Bajpai, Adv.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Pritinker Diwaker &**Hon'ble Shri Justice Gautam Chourdiya****Judgment On Board by Pritinker Diwaker, J****14/09/2018**

This appeal has been filed by the State against the judgment dated 17.01.2014 passed by Additional Sessions Judge, Bilaspur in Sessions Trial No. 75/2013 acquitting the accused/respondents of the charge under Sections 498-A/34 and 313/34 IPC.

2. Facts of the case in brief are that on 26.07.2012 written report (Ex.P-3) was lodged by complainant Anita Jatwar (PW-5) stating that she was married to respondent/accused namely Ramesh Kumar Jatwar about 11 years prior thereto and had two issues out of the wedlock. It is alleged that she was subjected to

harassment and ill-treatment by her husband in collusion with the other accused persons who happen to be her in-laws. Allegedly, she was even made to abort twice by them against her wishes. Based on this written report, FIR (Ex.P-4) was registered against the respondents/accused for the offences punishable under Sections 498-A, 313, 34 IPC. Thereafter, the Court below framed the charge against them accordingly.

3. So as to hold the accused/respondents guilty, prosecution has examined 08 witnesses in support of its case. Statements of the accused/respondents were also recorded under Section 313 of the Code of Criminal Procedure in which they denied the allegations made against them and pleaded innocence and false implication in the case.

4. After hearing the parties and appreciating the evidence on record the Court below has acquitted the accused/respondents of the charges levelled against them and therefore, the State has preferred this appeal against the judgment of acquittal.

5. Counsel for the appellant/State submits that the Court below has committed an error of law in acquitting the respondents/accused of the charges levelled against them by ignoring the evidence adduced by the prosecution.

6. Counsel for the respondents/accused however supports the judgment impugned and submits that while recording the finding of acquittal, the Court below has taken note of the evidence on record in proper perspective and there is no infirmity in the same warranting interference by this Court.

7. Heard counsel for the parties and perused the material on record.

8. Complainant (PW-5)) has stated that for about a year after marriage she was quite well in her matrimonial home but thereafter her husband started harassing her after consuming liquor. Other accused persons were also the supporters of her husband when he ill-treated and harassed her. The reason for harassment has been attributed to the demand of dowry made by the accused persons. According to her, when she informed her mother of the act of the accused persons she made her understand saying that everything would be alright with the passage of time and then acting upon the advice of her mother, she returned to her matrimonial home and gave birth to two issues. Thereafter, according to this witness, when she again became pregnant, the accused persons gave her certain medicines for abortion but as she did not abort completely, bleeding had started for which she was hospitalised and the expenses thereof were born by her parents and not by the accused persons. Now if the statement of the doctor (PW-1) who did the complete abortion is seen, it becomes apparent that the complainant had informed her about consuming the medicines for abortion of her own and it is on account of that she started bleeding. Babulal Lahre (PW-3) – the father of the complainant has stated that he was not aware as to for what the accused persons were harassing the complainant. Dilip Kumar Kosle (PW-2) – the maternal uncle of the complainant has turned hostile.

9. All this factual scenario makes this Court to hold that there are material inconsistencies in the statements of the witnesses. Had there been any harassment or cruelty to the complainant at the hands of the accused persons, she would have informed the same to her parents who in turn would have lodged the report with the police in this regard. However, nothing as such is on record.

Statement of doctor (PW-1) makes it clear that when she asked the complainant as to who administered the medicines for abortion to her, she told her that she herself had taken the same. Record also shows that the complainant lodged the written report about 11 years after the marriage and for such a long span of time neither she nor her parents made any complaint to the police regarding the alleged harassment by the accused persons. Trial Court thus appears to be fully justified in recording the finding of acquittal on the basis of material on record and there is no illegality or infirmity in the judgment giving acquittal. Even otherwise, as regards appeal against the judgment of acquittal, it is a settled position of law that if on the basis of material on record two views can be drawn then the preference has to be given to the one favouring the accused.

10. On viewing the evidence as above and being conscious to the existing legal position referred to above, this Court finds no substance in the appeal and accordingly the same is dismissed. Judgment impugned is affirmed.

Sd/-
(Pritinker Diwaker)
Judge

Sd/-
(Gautam Chourdiya)
Judge