

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

CRM-M No.40425 of 2019 (O&M)

Date of decision: 18th February, 2020

Jagdish @ Jagga & another

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE FATEH DEEP SINGH

Present: Mr. Saurabh Sharma, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Deepak Manchanda, Addl. Advocate General, Haryana
for the respondent/State.

FATEH DEEP SINGH, J.

Petitioners Jagdish alias Jagga and Saroj Bala being the parents-in-law of deceased Sonia have come up with this third regular bail application under Section 439 Cr.P.C. in case got registered by way of FIR No.305 dated 02.06.2018 under Sections 323, 302, 304-B, 506 IPC pertaining to Police Station City Yamunanagar.

The facts are that marriage of the deceased and her other younger sister Parvesh was solemnized with two brothers namely Neeraj and Husan, both sons of the petitioners, on 08.12.2012. The complainant Satbir Singh, unfortunate father of the deceased claimed that he had given enough dowry at the wedding but the accused were not happy with the same and kept on demanding more. The complainant claims that he had given ₹ 1.00 lakh each in May 2014 and November 2016 to the

accused to assuage their feelings but in spite of the same they did not desist and kept on harassing and humiliating the deceased, as a consequence of which she committed suicide on 30.05.2018 by hanging.

Learned counsel for the petitioners Mr. Saurabh Sharma, Advocate inter alia contends that both the petitioners are behind bars for more than 1 ½ years and there is no specific allegation against them as to demand of dowry, harassment or cruelty which forced the deceased to commit suicide. Learned counsel has laid much stress on the fact that the petitioners are aged persons and that the trial is not likely to conclude in the near future.

On behalf of the State, Mr. Deepak Manchanda, Addl. Advocate General, Haryana has vehemently opposed the bail claiming that no fresh ground has arisen necessitating filing of this third bail application and has shown apprehension that if allowed bail the petitioners will influence the witnesses in view of the fact that their another son too is married to the sister of the deceased.

Heard.

The previous two bail applications of the petitioners were dismissed by this Court. Learned counsel for the petitioners could not convince this Court what fresh grounds have arisen necessitating filing of the instant bail application. The apprehension of the State that if allowed

bail the petitioners might stifle the trial is not unfounded. There being no merit the present petition stands dismissed.

(FATEH DEEP SINGH)
JUDGE

February 18, 2020
rps

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