

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M- 33226 of 2020 (O&M)

Date of decision : 16.10.2020

...

Suman @ Sampti and another

.....Petitioners

vs.

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

**Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice H. S. Madaan**

Present: Mr. Johan Kumar, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.

...

**H. S. Madaan, J. (Oral)**

Case taken up through video conferencing.

This petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of pre-arrest bail has been filed by petitioners Suman @ Sampti, aged about 55 years wife of Roopiram and Charu, aged about 29 years, son of Roopiram, both residents of Kalyanpuri Jhuggi, PS SGM Nagar, Faridabad, being accused in FIR No. 64 dated 18.2.2019, for offences under Sections 498-A, 304B IPC, registered at Police Station NIT Faridabad, District Faridabad.

Briefly stated, facts of the case, as per the prosecution story

are that Sunita d/o Ramdass - complainant, resident of village Beant Singh Nagar, Bathinda, was married with Govinda s/o Roopiram, resident of Kalyanpuri NIT Faridabad, in the year 2014. Soon after marriage, Sunita was harassed by her husband Govinda, mother-in-law Sampti, sister-in-law Bharti and bother-in-law Charu, raising demand of dowry. Sunita had consumed poison and she died on 17.2.2019. Her father, Ramdass – complainant had reported the matter to the police stating that Charu, Sampti, Govinda and Bharti had killed Sunita by administering her the poison. Formal FIR was registered.

Apprehending their arrest in this case, accused Suman @ Sampti and Charu had approached the Court of Sessions at Faridabad, for grant of pre-arrest bail. However, their such petition was dismissed by learned Sessions Judge, Faridabad, vide order dated 28.9.2020. Feeling Aggrieved, they have approached this Court for grant of similar relief, which request is being opposed by the State counsel.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners, learned State counsel, besides going through the record.

In this case, petitioners – accused are specifically named in the FIR and allegations of their harassing and maltreating deceased Sunita and administering poison to her are there. Though the police had filed challan against Govinda, husband of the deceased, but as submitted by the State counsel, the other persons named in the FIR as co-accused had not been exonerated and they could not be sent up to

face trial since they were on run and could not be arrested.

A young married woman had died within 7 years of her marriage. There are specific allegations of harassment and maltreatment against the present petitioners. Further there are allegations of petitioners alongwith their co-accused having administered poison to the deceased.

Keeping in view the seriousness and gravity of allegations, no case for grant of pre-arrest bail to them is made out.

The petition so filed is dismissed accordingly.

However, nothing discussed above shall have any bearing on the merits of the case.

**16.10.2020**  
chugh

**( H.S. Madaan )**  
**Judge**

Whether speaking / reasoned                      Yes / No

Whether reportable                                      Yes / No