

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

CRM-M-37570-2020 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 22.03.2021

Santosh Devi

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. Parveen Kumar, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Ms. Sheenu Sura, DAG, Haryana,
assisted by ASI Rajnish Kumar.

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has approached this Court seeking grant of anticipatory bail in respect of a case registered against her vide FIR No.0127 dated 21.07.2020 at Police Station Kunjpura, District Karnal, under Sections 120-B/315/377/406/498-A/506 IPC.
2. The FIR in question was lodged at the instance of Sawita, wherein it has been alleged that her marriage was solemnized on 27.11.2016 with Ashok Kumar, wherein dowry was given by her parents much more than their means. However, her husband Ashok Kumar, mother-in-law Santosh Devi (petitioner), father-in-law Satbir Singh and brother-in-laws Vijay and Sultan used to taunt her for not having brought sufficient dowry. It is further alleged that when she got pregnant in July, 2017, she was forced to get her pregnancy terminated. She further alleged that during her pregnancy, her husband tried to establish un-natural sexual relationship with her and that she used to be given beatings by the

accused. It is further alleged that even her father-in-law and brother-in-law behaved inappropriately with her. She alleged that ultimately she was constrained to leave her matrimonial home.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that she has falsely been implicated in the instant case and that there is no evidence worth credence to show that the petitioner had committed any offence.
4. Opposing the petition, learned State counsel has submitted that since specific allegations have been levelled against the petitioner, no case for grant of bail is made out.
5. I have considered rival submissions addressed before this Court.
6. The matter in hand has apparently arisen out of some kind of matrimonial discord amongst the complainant and her husband. In any case, since the petitioner is stated to have joined investigation and is a lady and challan already stands presented, her custodial interrogation is not warranted. The petition, as such, is accepted and the interim directions issued by this Court vide order dated 16.11.2020 are hereby made absolute subject to the condition that the petitioner shall join investigation as and when called upon to do so and cooperate with the Investigating Officer and shall also abide by the conditions as provided under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

22.03.2021

Vimal

(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: **Yes/No**

Whether reportable: **Yes/No**