

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRR No. 1238 of 2018 (O&M)

Date of decision : 17.7.2018

...

Parmod Rani

.....Petitioner

vs.

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice H. S. Madaan

Present: Mr. Sandeep Kotla, Advocate
for the petitioner.

...

H. S. Madaan, J. (Oral)

This revision petition has been filed against order dated 23.1.2018 passed by the Court of Additional Sessions Judge, Hisar, vide which he had dismissed application under Section 319 Cr.P.C. for summoning of Om Pati, Sunita, Vinod, Roshni, Anand Kumar, Ram Parkash and Sadhna, as additional accused, filed by complainant Parmod Rani.

Briefly stated, facts of the case are that Parmod Rani had lodged FIR No. 12 dated 8.3.2017, for offences under Sections 328, 406, 498-A IPC, against her husband Munish, mother-in-law Om Pati, elder brother-in-law (Jeth) Vinod , two sister's-in-law (Nanad) namely, Sunita and Roshni, their husbands Anand Kumar and Ram Parkash, as well as, sister of Anand Kumar, namely Sadhna, on the allegations of maltreatment, on account of demand of more dowry and administration of poison to her. As a result of investigation, only

Munish was challaned. During the trial, an application under Section 319 Cr.P.C. was filed for summoning of additional accused which was dismissed by the trial Court, leaving the complainant aggrieved and she has filed the present revision petition.

I have gone through the file, specially, the impugned order and I find that the order is well reasoned one, based upon proper appraisal and appreciation of evidence and correct interpretation of law. The latest legal position on the subject has been discussed, referring to various authorities. The trial Court has observed that the version set up in the FIR has been repeated by the complainant while getting her statement recorded as PW-1 and admittedly on the basis of allegations levelled in the FIR. The investigation was carried out and during investigation the proposed accused were found innocent and no new facts have come on record to suggest that the investigation conducted by the police with regard to the innocence of proposed accused was wrong.

Thus I do not see any reason to interfere with the impugned order, while exercising the revisional jurisdiction, which as a matter of fact is quite limited.

Accordingly, the revision petition stands dismissed.

17.7.2018
chugh

(H.S. Madaan)
Judge

Whether speaking / reasoned	Yes / No
Whether reportable	Yes / No