

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

CRM-M-43588-2018 (O&M)

Date of decision: 8.5.2019

Sushma and another

... Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Haryana and another

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI

Present: Mr. Chanderhas Yadav, Advocate.
for the petitioners.

Mr. Vikas Chopra, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Gurcharan Dass, Advocate,
for respondent No.2.

RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Section 438 Code of Criminal Procedure for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.54 dated 4.9.2018 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 323, 498-A, 406, 506, 354-A, 34 of Indian Penal Code, at Police Station Women, District Hisar.

Heard.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has placed on record photocopy of the conversation between the complainant and her husband. Similarly, learned counsel for the complainant also placed on record photocopy of the conversation between the complainant and her husband.

The allegations have been levelled against the petitioner-Smt.Sushma, father-in-law/Sh.Bharat Bhushan and their son.

Learned State counsel states that Shri Bharat Bhushan, father-

in-law has been exonerated during the investigation. At this, learned counsel for the petitioners seeks permission to withdraw the present petition qua petitioner No.2-Sh.Bharat Bhushan. Permitted to do so. Dismissed as withdrawn qua petitioner No.2-Sh.Bharat Bhushan.

Learned State counsel has also filed status report by way of affidavit of Narender Kumar, Deputy Superintendent of Police (D), Hisar in Court today which is taken on record.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that in the previous application/complaint submitted on 14.12.2017, she alleged that only few articles of gold have been given but later on, she has given completely a changed version.

Learned State counsel states that no recovery of any article has been effected although Smt. Sushma has joined the investigation.

Keeping in view the facts and allegations levelled against the petitioner especially the son of the petitioner, i.e., the husband of the complainant has gone abroad without disclosing his address. His address has not been stated either by petitioner No.1 or by her husband-petitioner No.2.

It has been further argued that vide Annexure P-8, a notice was published in the newspaper 'Dainik Tribune' on May 27, 2017 regarding disowning of their son and daughter-in-law but the entrustment has been made much prior to it.

Complainant who is present in Court submits that more than 6 tolas of gold are still in possession of Smt.Sushma and she is not returning the same.

Keeping in view the above, petitioner No.1-Smt.Sushma is not

entitled to the concession of pre-arrest bail.

Dismissed.

May 8, 2019
Paritosh Kumar

(RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI)
JUDGE

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