

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Criminal Misc. No. M-45011 of 2019 (O&M)
Date of decision : December 11, 2019

Rajrati

....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

....Respondent

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Fateh Deep Singh

Present : Mr. Pradeep Virk, Advocate, for the petitioner

Ms. Trishangali Sharma, AAG, Haryana for the State

Fateh Deep Singh, J. (Oral)

The facts in this first regular bail application under Section 439 Cr.P.C. against accused Rajrati in case FIR No. 129 dated 22.3.2019 under Sections 306 and 34 IPC and later on converted to Section 304-B and 34 IPC, Police Station Meham, Rohtak have been come about by complainant Birmati mother of deceased Anju. It is alleged that marriage between the deceased and Manoj accused was solemnized in the year 2012 and the couple was bestowed with a son aged around five years. The complainant

alleges that her daughter was harassed by the in-laws and was physically and mentally tortured. On 22.3.2019 she received information that deceased committed suicide by means of hanging leading to the registration of the present case.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that petitioner is behind bars since 1.4.2019 and there is no allegation to bring about offence under Section 304-B IPC as there is neither any injury upon the dead body nor anyone has been specifically attributed any role in the commission of the offence.

Learned State counsel has opposed the grant of bail on the grounds of seriousness of the allegations and the fact that within five years the deceased died an un-natural death on account of physical and mental torture at the hands of the accused including the present petitioner who happens to be the mother-in-law.

Going through the submissions, admittedly the petitioner is mother-in-law of the deceased. There are specific allegations levelled against the petitioner for being instrumental in the harassment and torture of the deceased. The deceased has died within five years of marriage. The apprehension of the State that if allowed bail, the petitioner might stifle the trial is not unfounded. No ground for allowing the bail is made out. The present petition as

such stands dismissed.

The observations made herein above shall have no bearing on the merits of the case as these are purely for the disposal of the present bail application.

December 11, 2019

'tiwana'

(Fateh Deep Singh)
Judge

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned ?</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable ?</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>