

CRM-M-27157-2020

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

CRM-M-27157-2020

Date of decision:09.11.2020

Manju

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Baldev Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ramesh Kumar Ambavta, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Inderjeet Singh, Advocate,
for the complainant.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J.

Case is taken up for hearing through video conferencing.

Through this petition, the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No.161 dated 27.10.2019, registered at Police Station Sadhaura, District Yamuna Nagar, under Sections 306 and 34 IPC.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner, who is a widow and is to shoulder on her 06-year old son, has falsely been implicated in the present case; that she has no concern with the alleged crime; that the allegations of harassment are not sustainable without there being any positive action proximate to the time of occurrence on the part of the petitioner, which led or compelled the deceased to commit suicide, and that no role by an act of instigation or by doing certain acts to facilitate the commission of suicide, has been attributed to the petitioner which is said to have abetted the commission of suicide.

CRM-M-27157-2020

Per contra, the learned State counsel while opposing the submissions made on behalf of the petitioner submits that the petitioner has specifically been named in the suicide note left by the deceased and the petitioner was also named by the deceased in the videography prepared by him with his mobile phone immediately before his death. He further submits that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required.

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

The petitioner has been specifically named in the suicide note left by the deceased. The deceased had also named the petitioner in the videography prepared by him with his mobile phone immediately before his death. As per the status report filed by respondent-State, the report in respect of comparison of data contained in mobile phones make Redmi and Samsung with the data contained in pen drive make SanDisk has been received from the FSL, Madhuban. The opinion of the FSL Lab., as mentioned in the status report, would read as under:

“Opinion: On further analysis it has been opined that the above said one (01) audio file marked QC3 is exactly the same audio file which has been marked QCI & QC2 and retrieved from the exhibits Exb-1M & Exb-1MMc, respectively.”

Keeping in view the nature of crime, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required.

Therefore, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is dismissed.

09.11.2020

parveen kumar

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No