

**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
At Chandigarh**

CRM-M-46864-2019 (O&M)
Date of Decision:-3.12.2019

Khatooni and another ... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Gurdas Singh Sarwara, Advocate for
Mr. Salim Ahmed, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Ashok Singh Choudhary, Addl. Advocate General, Haryana.

Mr. Shiva Khurmi, Advocate for the complainant.

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J.

1. The petitioners have approached this Court seeking grant of anticipatory bail in respect of a case registered vide FIR No.0429 dated 16.8.2019 at Police Station Tauru District Nuh under Sections 323, 326-A, 427, 452, 506, 380 and 34 of Indian Penal Code.
2. The FIR was lodged at the instance of Sakila, wherein it has been alleged that her father-in-law Rujdar had performed three marriages and that his first wife is named Jayada and a son namely Sazid was born out of the said marriage, who happens to be husband of the complainant. The name of the second wife of complainant's father-in-law is Anisa and a daughter was born out of the said second marriage, but her father-in-law had abandoned the said second wife and the daughter from the said second marriage. The third

marriage was solemnized by complainant's father-in-law with Khatooni and two children were born out of the said third marriage, while Khatooni was already having two children from her previous marriage. The two children born out of the said third marriage were named as Aabid (son) and Miskina (daughter). It is alleged that complainant's father-in-law Rujdar, Khatooni, the 3rd wife of complainant's father-in-law, Sanjida and Rihana both daughters of Rujdar (infact from Khatooni's earlier husband) wanted to grab the share of property of complainant's husband and had tried to kill her by throwing acid on her. It is further alleged that complainant's husband had already filed a case regarding property in the Courts at Nuh. The complainant alleged that previously also i.e. on 19.3.2019, the accused had thrown acid on her with an intention to kill her.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the petitioners have falsely been implicated in the present case in order to pressurize them to give up their legitimate claim in the property and to make the petitioners part with money and that no such occurrence, as alleged in the FIR, had ever taken place.
4. Opposing the petition, the learned State counsel has submitted that since serious allegations of pouring acid have been levelled in the FIR which stand substantiated from the MLR in respect of the medical examination of the complainant Sakila, which was conducted on 20.3.2019, no case for grant of bail is made out.
5. I have considered rival submissions addressed before this Court.
6. Apart from the fact that serious allegations of throwing of acid have been levelled in the FIR, a perusal of the MLR clearly reveals that the acid burns

were found on the body of the complainant which would substantiate the allegations levelled in the FIR.

7. In view of the aforesaid position and bearing in mind the serious nature of allegations, this Court does not find any special case for grant of anticipatory bail. The petition is sans merit and is dismissed.

3.12.2019

pankaj

**(Gurvinder Singh Gill)
Judge**

Whether speaking /reasoned

Yes / No

Whether Reportable

Yes / No