

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

**CRR-16-2019 (O&M)
Date of Decision : 14.01.2019**

Rinku and others

..... Petitioners

Versus

Poonam

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI

Present : Mr. Deepak Goyal, Advocate
for the petitioners.

RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI, J. (Oral)

The petitioners have preferred the instant revision petition under Section 401 Cr.P.C. against the order dated 20.11.2018, passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Bathinda, vide which the petitioners have been summoned to face trial for the offences under Sections 12 and 18 of the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005.

This Court would like to reproduce para No.3 of the complaint (Annexure P-1) as under:-

“That at the time of marriage the parents of the applicant had spent about Rs.12 lakh on the marriage according to demand and desire of respondents and had given one gold ring, gold chain and 2 silver coins, 11 gold rice, one watch and Rs.11,000/- in cash with pant coat, pant shirt were given to respondent No.1, one gold ring and silver payals and Rs.1100/- were given to respondent No.3, one gold ring and Rs.1100/- cash were given to respondent No.2, silver payals and Rs.1100/- each were given to respondents No.4 and 6 and one married sister of respondent No.1, one gold ring and Rs.500/- cash were given to Sandeep Kumar husband of Neetu

married sister of respondent No.1. Besides it, two gold set, 4 gold bangles, two ladies rings, silver payals, and other silver articles to the applicant. Further furniture containing double box bed with quilts, sofa-set, fridge, cooler, dinning table set, almirah, washing machine, scooter, dressing table set, iron box, sewing machine, iron, juicer, 15 suits, 10 sarees, 11 summer beddings and 11 winter beddings with utensils, crockery, etc. were given for the use of the applicants. Besides it, Rs.2,00,000/- were spent on the marriage party. All the above said articles are istridhan of the applicant.”

Without commenting upon the merits of the case, this court is of the view that nothing is placed on record to intervene the impugned order and nothing has been come out if the impugned order suffers from any illegality, irregularity and infirmity, therefore, the same does not call for any interference and is hereby affirmed.

As such, finding no merit in the instant revision petition, the same is dismissed.

**(RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI)
JUDGE**

14.01.2019
mamta

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable :

Yes/No
Yes/No