

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

115

Criminal Revision No.1935 of 2018
Date of Decision: May 30th, 2018

Indro Devi

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH

Present: Ms. Aashna Gill and Mr. Aman Pal, Advocates
for the petitioner.

AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH, J. (ORAL)

This petition has been filed challenging the order dated 17.04.2018 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Gurugram, whereby an application preferred by complainant-Indro Devi through the Public Prosecutor for summoning Pallavi as an additional accused to face trial under Section 306/34 IPC, has been dismissed.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has stated that there is a suicide note/Will of deceased Bharat Kumar, which implicates Pallavi, who is being sought to be summoned as an additional accused. She contends that it is because of the allegation and the doubt of Sheetal, the wife of the deceased, that the deceased had sexually harassed her sister, that the dispute arose which was false. There was threats given by Sheetal that she would implicate her husband and because of which the things turned bad to worse. She also asserts that the deceased while concluding his suicide note has specifically mentioned name of Pallavi to be one of the persons to be responsible for the suicide. Apart from that, the complainant, before the trial Court, in her statement has also specified as to on what occasions and how Pallavi had instigated Sheetal, which ultimately resulted in the death of Bharat Kumar. She on this basis contends that the present application

should have been allowed by the trial Court.

Having considered the submissions made by the counsel for the petitioner, the pleading and the records of the case, the Court is not convinced with the pleas, as have been taken with reference to Pallavi, however, without commenting upon the merits of the case, it would be sufficient to observe that the role, which is attributed to Pallavi, has been rightly appreciated by the trial Court while passing the impugned order and, therefore, does not call for any interference by this Court in exercise of its revisional jurisdiction.

The petition, therefore, stands dismissed.

May 30th, 2018
Puneet

(AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No