

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

CRM-M-44406-2019

Date of decision: 24.10.2019

SURJIT SINGH

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. N.S. Shekhawat, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ashok Singh Choudhary, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner seeks grant of regular bail in case registered vide FIR No.29 dated 9.3.2018 under Sections 323, 302, 304-B & 34 of the Indian Penal Code, registered at Police Station Shahzadpur, District Ambala.
2. The FIR was lodged at the instance of Ajmer father of deceased wherein it has been alleged that his daughter Rita Rani was married to Deepak in the year 2016 and that he had given dowry beyond his means. However, Deepak as well as father-in-law, Surjit Ram (petitioner), mother-in-law Kala Devi, brother-in-law Ravinder Kumar, sister-in-law (*'Jethani'*) Ritu Rani used to taunt his daughter for having brought less dowry and used to demand more dowry. It is alleged that although an amount of ₹3 lacs was

given when she gave birth to a son, but her in-laws were not happy with the same. It is further stated therein that on 9th March, 2018 a telephonic message was received that complainant's daughter had died. It is further the case of prosecution that when the complainant and others went to the matrimonial home of complainant's daughter they found that the dead body of complainant's daughter bore injury marks on her neck. It is thus alleged that Rita Rani had been killed by her husband and other members of his family by strangulating her.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that as per the opinion regarding cause of death as mentioned in post-mortem report, Ritu Rani had died on account of hanging and thus it cannot be said to be a case of murder. It has further been submitted that deceased was apparently under some kind of depression and had committed suicide and the petitioner who is father-in-law cannot be held responsible in any manner especially when there is no specific demand of dowry and harassment against the petitioner and only vague and general allegations have been levelled in the FIR.
4. Opposing the petition, learned State counsel submits that since the petitioner is specifically named in the FIR, no case for grant of regular bail is made out. It has however been informed that the petitioner till date has been behind bars since last 1 year & 7 months and as on date 17 PWs out of the cited 25 PWs have been examined.
5. Having considered rival contentions addressed before this Court and while refraining from expressing any opinion on merits of the case and bearing in mind the fact that the petitioner who is an aged man of 61 years

has been behind bars since 1 year & 7 months, further detention of the petitioner will not serve any purpose. The petition, as such, is accepted and it is ordered that petitioner be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

24.10.2019
Gaurav Sorot

(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned / speaking? **Yes / No**

Whether reportable? **Yes / No**