

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

CRR No.4613 of 2017 (O&M)
Date of Decision: March 23, 2018

Vandana Sachdeva

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present:- None.

JAISHREE THAKUR, J. (Oral)

This is a criminal revision that has been filed seeking to challenge the order dated 21.09.2017 passed by JMIC, Yamuna Nagar, whereby the application preferred by the petitioner under Section 319 Cr.P.C. has been dismissed.

In brief, an FIR No.407 dated 17.07.2014, under Sections 498-A, 323, 406, 506 of Indian Penal Code came to lodged by the petitioner-complainant at Police Station City Yamuna Nagar and after due investigation, the challan was presented only against Vipin Sachdeva, husband of the petitioner. However, during investigation, respondent No.2-Rajni and respondent No.3-Satnam Kaur were found innocent and kept in column No.2. During the course of trial, statement of the petitioner was recorded, in which she reiterated the contents of the FIR and thereafter, the prosecution moved an application under Section 319 Cr.P.C. to summon

respondents No.2 and 3 herein as additional accused, which application came to be dismissed by the JMIC, Yamuna Nagar, on the ground that there is nothing on the record to substantiate the fact that Rajni and Satnam Kaur had ever demanded dowry from the petitioner. There is no medical record that has been relied upon by the prosecutrix to suggest that she had been subjected to any beatings by the proposed accused persons.

The instant criminal revision has been filed as far back as December, 2017 and has been adjourned on several occasions thereafter. On 09.02.2018, there was no representation on behalf of the petitioner even in the second round and in the interest of justice, the case was adjourned for 23.03.2018.

Today, the matter has been called twice, but there is no appearance on behalf of the petitioner. It appears that the petitioner is not interested in pursuing with the matter. Under these circumstances, this court has left with no option, but to dismiss the instant criminal revision for want of prosecution.

Ordered accordingly.

March 23, 2018

vijay saini

(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No