

**(Proceedings conducted through video conferencing on account of
Covid-19 Pandemic)**

CRM-M-21231-2020

Date of Decision: 31.07.2020

SUNITA

... PETITIONER

VS.

STATE OF HARYANA

.. RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIVEK PURI

Present : Mr. Narinder Hooda, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Sudhir Hooda, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Manish Dadwal, AAG, Haryana.

VIVEK PURI, J.(ORAL)

Briefly, FIR No.48 dated 29.01.2020 has been registered on the basis of statement of Dheeraj alleging that the marriage of his sister, namely, Anuradha @ Annu was solemnized on 18.10.2018 with Anurag. Sufficient dowry articles were given at the time of marriage but the family members of her in-laws continued to harass her. On 28.01.2020, at about 02:00 P.M., the complainant received a telephonic message from Anurag that Annu has suffered heart attack. On seeing the dead body, it revealed that there were marks around the neck of the deceased.

It has been argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that father-in-law and brother-in-law of the deceased have been found to be innocent. The petitioner is a lady and her arrest was effected on 21.03.2020 and no specific allegation of demand of dowry has been levelled in the FIR. It has been further argued that the supplementary statement of the complainant was recorded after 10 days, wherein, the allegations of demand of car or cash were levelled against the petitioner.

On the contrary, it has been pointed out by learned State counsel that as per the post-mortem report, there were ligature marks on the neck of the deceased. It has been further stated that as per post-mortem report the possibility of death due to hanging cannot be ruled out. He further contends that the report of FSL has not been received.

In the instant case, the daughter-in-law of the petitioner has died, otherwise, than under normal circumstances within a period of about one year and 03 months from the marriage. It will be too early to conclude that a false version has been sought to be introduced in the supplementary statement of the complainant. Furthermore, there is specific and categoric allegation with regard to the harassment to the deceased on account of demand of car or cash. The petitioner is mother-in-law of the deceased. The death has occurred within a period of one year and three months from the date of marriage and deceased was being harassed on account of demand of car and cash. Such like offences cannot be viewed lightly. Moreover, the trial is still at the initial stage. The gravity of allegations and the severity of sentence in the event of conviction are the significant factors which are to be looked into at the time of extending the concession of bail.

In these circumstances, no ground is made out to extend the concession of bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the petition stands dismissed.

31.07.2020
smriti

(VIVEK PURI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	: Yes/No
Whether Reportable	: Yes/No