

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

CRR-2640-2015

Date of decision:-25.7.2018

Smt.Vandana

...Petitioner

Versus

State of U.T. and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE H.S.MADAAN

Present: Mr.Ashok Sharma Nabhewala, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms.Ashima Mor, APP, U.T., Chandigarh.

Ms.Payal Mehta, Advocate
for respondents No.2 to 4.

H.S. MADAAN, J.

The complainant Vandana had got registered FIR No.82 dated 20.5.2018 for the offences under Sections 406, 498-A IPC with Police Station Sector-19, Chandigarh against her husband - Raman Ahuja, father-in-law - Joginder Parkash, mother-in-law - Sudarshan Kumari and others on the allegations that after her marriage with Raman Ahuja on 13.2.2006, she was harassed, maltreated and tortured so as to force her to bring more dowry articles from her parents, who had already spent a considerable amount at the time of marriage giving a substantial number

of articles as gifts as dowry, which formed her *ISTRIDHAN* and that the *ISTRIDHAN* articles had been entrusted to the accused, who committed criminal breach of trust in that regard. After registration of the FIR, the matter was investigated. Accused Raman Ahuja, Joginder Parkash and Sudarshan Kumari were challaned. They faced trial by Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Chandigarh, who vide judgment dated 13.5.2014 acquitted them of the charge framed against them holding that the prosecution had failed to prove guilt of the accused beyond a shadow of reasonable doubt.

Feeling aggrieved by the said judgment, the complainant as well as State had preferred separate appeals, which were however dismissed by learned Additional Sessions Judge – cum – Judge, Special Court, Chandigarh vide consolidated judgment dated 13..2.2015.

Now the complainant has filed the present revision petition submitting that the judgments passed by the Courts below be set aside by way of acceptance of revision petition and the accused be convicted and sentenced accordingly.

Notice of the revision petition was issued to the respondents, who put in appearance through counsel.

I have heard counsel for the parties besides going through the record.

After hearing the rival contentions, I find that law is well settled that the revisional jurisdiction of this Court is quite limited. This Court is to interfere only if there is an illegality or infirmity apparent on the face of the judgment/order passed by a Court below or the same is perverse and not otherwise.

In the present case, I do not find any such illegality or infirmity with the impugned judgments much less apparent on the face of those. The judgments are certainly not in violation of settled principles of criminal jurisprudence. I do not see any reason to upset the impugned judgments.

Resultantly, the revision petition stands dismissed accordingly.

25.7.2018

Brij

(H.S.MADAAN)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No