

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

CRM-M-57216-2018

Date of decision: January 22, 2019

Sumitra

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI

Present: Mr. Navneet Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikas Chopra, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Kartar Singh Malik-I, Advocate
for the complainant.

RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI, J.

Petitioner is seeking regular bail in case FIR No.280 dated 20.05.2018, under Sections 304-B and 498-A read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code, registered at Police Station Sadar, Sonipat, District Sonipat.

Briefly stated that deceased-Ankita was married with Nitin son of Ramphal. Petitioner is the mother-in-law of the deceased. It is alleged that the petitioner and other family members had been demanding more dowry and they were taunting her. It is specifically stated that Nitin was having an affair with some other girl, and his mother as well as his sister were threatening the deceased that they would kill her and marry Nitin to the said girl. Deceased was pursuing M.Tech and her expenses was borne out by her parents. It is specifically stated that on 19.05.2018 in the afternoon, deceased called from mobile phone No.8708156475 to her mother whose Mob No.9991178593 and she told that the petitioner and other family members wanted to move her and she requested her parents to

bring her back. However, her mother said that they are coming by night.

Thereafter, the deceased send the message on her mobile phone that '*meri maut ka jimmedar Nitin or iski maa hai inhone mujhe bahot torture kiya hai*'. She was found dead after jumping from the roof.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and gone through the material available on record.

Although, petitioner is an old aged lady yet serious allegations have been levelled against her. The possibility could not be ruled out if she has committed crime by throwing the deceased from 10th floor of the building.

Keeping in view the material available on record and seriousness of the offence, this court is of the view that petitioner is not entitled for the concession of regular bail.

Petition stands dismissed accordingly.

However, nothing expressed above shall affect the merits of the case.

(RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI)
JUDGE

January 22, 2019
m. sharma

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